the ''no-action'' alternative. Under this alternative the Park Service would continue to manage the national seashore to protect natural and cultural resources, while allowing for appropriate public use related to those resources. Essentially no new development for public use would be undertaken.

Alternative 2, the proposed plan, would guide the overall management of Cape Cod National Seashore for the next 10 to 15 years. The emphasis of the plan is on the management of natural and cultural resources; public use and interpretation; coordination with nonfederal landowners within the national seashore; administrative, maintenance, and operational concerns; and working with local residents, town and county officials and interested agencies and persons to resolve problems of mutual concern. The plan is programmatic in that it gives guidance and criteria for day-to-day decision making and for producing more specific future action and development plans. It would seek to maintain an appropriate balance between resource protection and public use. More opportunities would be provided for the public to experience the resources of the national seashore. Existing public use facilities and attractions would be improved. No major new development, however, is proposed , and the built environment or impacts from development would be reduced where possible. Under alternative 2 there would be more emphasis on preserving the ''timeless'' character of Cape Cod in terms of natural and dynamic landscapes, historic architecture and cultural landscapes, and customary activities. The National Park Service would work in partnership with local communities and officials to more effectively further educational and interpretive opportunities and resource stewardship on the Outer Cape and to more successfully address mutual problems and concerns, such as water quality, coastal processes, and traffic congestion—concerns that transcend political boundaries.

Alternative 3 builds on the approach of alternative 2, proposing that national seashore managers play a more formal role in directing efforts to protect and manage resources on the Cape through more structured partnerships. Included are other reasonable actions that could be implemented but that are significantly different from those presented in either alternative 1 or 2, and they are often more costly. The Park Service would initiate and enter into more formal agreements with state and local agencies to improve collaboration and consistency in day-to-day resource management. These actions are specific to selected management topics only, not to each subject area.

The draft environmental impact statement was available for public review from August 19, 1996 to December 31, 1996; comments and responses on that document on that document are reprinted in volume 2. The final environmental impact statement has been revised to reflect substantive comments and concerns received during the comment period, and the text has been refined and clarified where necessary.

DATES: The FEIS will be made available on February 27, 1998. Following a 30-day no action period a Record of Decision documenting the agency's decision will be issued.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Public reading copies of the FEIS will be available for review at the following locations:

National Seashore Headquarters, 99 Marconi Site Road, Wellfleet, MA 02667

Town libraries in Chatham, Eastham, Orleans, Provincetown, Truro, and Wellfleet

A limited number of copies of the FEIS can be obtained by writing to: Ms. Maria Burks, Superintendent, Cape Cod National Seashore, 99 Marconi Site Road, Wellfleet, MA 02667, or by calling the front desk at (508) 349–3785.

Dated: February 17, 1998.

Maria Burks,

Superintendent, Cape Cod National Seashore.

[FR Doc. 98–5285 Filed 2–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Shenandoah National Park, Facility Development Plan; Notice of Termination

February 3, 1998.

SUMMARY: The National Park Service is terminating the Environmental Impact Statement, Facility Development Plan, Shenandoah National Park.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Sandy Rives, National Park Service, Shenandoah National Park, Luray, Virginia 22835; 540–999–3453.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Park Service published a Notice of Intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for the facility development plan project, Shenandoah National Park in the **Federal Register**, 58 FR 45529 dated 30 August, 1993. Scoping meetings were held throughout the region of Shenandoah National Park.

A draft EIS was field with EPA 1 July, 1996. Public review was conducted, no substantive comments were received. An abbreviated final EIS was filed with EPA 21 July, 1997.

During the planning process, the National Park Service determined that all of the housing units identified in the plan could not be built, and that many of the other building projects including maintenance buildings, staging facilities etc., also would have to be greatly reduced in size and scope, or could not be built. Further, during the 4 year process from the initial development of the project until the present, the project has become economically unfeasible, and, therefore, the extent of the project outlined in the DEIS is no longer being considered.

If planning resumes, a Notice of Intent will be published.

Douglas K. Morris,

Superintendent.

[FR Doc. 98–5280 Filed 2–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for a General Management Plan for Fort Pulaski National Monument, Georgia

AGENCY: National Park Service.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for a General Management Plan for Fort Pulaski National Monument, Georgia.

SUMMARY: The park is operating with a very old 1971 Master Plan that is obsolete and outdated and not prepared according to current National Park Service policies. Key management concerns include the identification of general strategies for the management of cultural features and artifacts, protection of natural resources and the historic setting, identification of and provision for desirable visitor experiences, effect of land use changes on park resources, and the expectation of little or no increases in budget and staff.

The plan will identify a resource-based framework for the park and describe desired future conditions, alternatives and general strategies, consistent with the park's purpose, significance, and mandates.

The alternatives and general strategies required to achieve desired future

conditions will then be assessed for their environmental effects.

DATES: A series of public meetings will be held in surrounding communities in the summer of 1998. Please consult with local newspapers for the times and locations or call the park for this information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent, Fort Pulaski National Monument, P.O. Box 30757, Savannah, Georgia 31410–0757, Telephone: (912) 786–5787.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Park Service is beginning this planning process and invites your comments. You may provide your comments in person at the public meetings or by mail to the Superintendent at the above address. Comments by mail should reach the Superintendent by July 1, 1998. Issues for evaluation may be suggested as well as alternatives for addressing the issues. A draft of the plan and environmental impact statement is expected to be available for public review by the winter of 1998/1999. Your input is appreciated.

Dated: February 13, 1998.

Daniel W. Brown,

Acting Regional Director, Southeast Region.

[FR Doc. 98–5281 Filed 2–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for a General Management Plan for Fort Raleigh National Historic Site, North Carolina

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for a General Management Plan for Fort Raleigh National Historic Site, North Carolina.

SUMMARY: The park is operating with an outdated 1966 Master Plan that is not consistent with current National Park Service policies. Key management concerns include the identification of general strategies to address the addition of over 300 acres, changes to the purpose and significance of the park, identification of and provision for desirable visitor experiences and facilities, protection of natural and cultural resources, enhancement of relationships with others in the area, the role of archaeological education and the expectation of little or no increases in budget and staff.

The plan will identify a resource-based framework for the park and describe desired future conditions, alternatives, and general strategies, consistent with the park's purpose, significance, and mandates.

The alternatives and general strategies required to achieve desired future conditions will then be assessed for their environmental effects.

DATES: A series of public meetings will be held in surrounding communities in the winter and spring of 1998. Please consult with local newspapers for the times and locations or call the park for this information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent, Cape Hatteras National Seashore, Route 1, Box 675, Manteo, North Carolina 27954, Telephone: (919) 473–2111.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Park Service is beginning this planning process and invites your comments. You may provide your comments in person at the public meetings or by mail to the Superintendent at the above address. Comments by mail should reach the Superintendent by July 1, 1998. Issues for evaluation may be suggested as well as alternatives for addressing the issues. A draft of the plan and environmental impact statement is expected to be available for public review by the winter of 1998/1999. Your input is appreciated.

Dated: February 13, 1998.

Daniel W. Brown,

Regional Director, Southeast Region.

[FR Doc. 98–5283 Filed 2–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Isle Royale National Park

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 the National Park Service announces the availability of the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (GMP/EIS) for Isle Royale National Park. This notice also announces public meetings for the purpose of receiving public comments on the Draft GMP/EIS.

The purpose of the general management plan is to set forth the basic management philosophy and to provide the strategies for addressing issues and achieving management objectives over the next 15 to 20 years. This Draft GMP/EIS describes and evaluates five alternatives for the management of Isle Royale National Park.

Alternative A (No Action): Alternative A is the no-action, or status quo, alternative and provides a baseline for comparison of the other four alternatives.

Proposed Action: The proposed action is the National Park Service's preferred alternative. It would emphasize separation of uses and improvement of visitor experiences. Rock Harbor and Windigo would continue to be the focus of visitor services. Some historic structures would be preserved. Use would be distributed fairly evenly across the island. Limits on use would be likely. Lodging and other services would be reduced at Rock Harbor.

Alternative B: Alternative B would expand facilities and services at the ends of the island and create a more primitive experience toward the center. Cultural resources would be preserved only at the ends of the island. Use limits would be imposed in some zones. Some facilities in developed areas would be expanded to serve visitors preparing to enter the backcountry.

Alternative C: Alternative C would scale back all development to create a more primitive park. No interpretive media or formal programs would be offered on the island. All cultural resources would be documented and allowed to deteriorate. A narrower range of experiences would be available. Visitor numbers would be lowered and use limits would be instituted islandwide. All concessions and related facilities would be removed.

Alternative D: Alternative D was modified to become the proposed action, above.

Alternative E: Alternative E would allow management of the park to continue as it is now, but visitor numbers would be controlled and would be low. Historic structures would be preserved according to significance. A variety of uses would continue and would take place across the island.

The potential consequences of the actions in the alternatives on natural resources, cultural resources, visitor use and experiences, park operations, and the socioeconomic environment have been evaluated. In general, all alternatives would better protect the park's natural resources than the current management direction (alternative A). Alternative C would provide the greatest benefit to natural resources but would have the most negative effects on cultural resources and on visitor use. The proposed action and alternative E would best protect cultural resources. Impacts on park operations from the alternatives would be mixed; the