Lakeview District Manager who may sustain, vacate or modify this realty action. In the absence of any objections, this realty action will become the final determination of the Department of the Interior.

Scott R. Florence,

Field Manager, Lakeview Resource Area.

[FR Doc. 99–14411 Filed 6–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–33–U

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

National Capital Region; Environmental Assessment of Proposed Land Exchange, George Washington Memorial Parkway, City of Alexandria and Arlington County, VA

ACTION: Notice of the availability of an environmental assessment (EA) for proposed exchange of land interests between the National Park Service, and Commonwealth Atlantic Properties, Inc., Commonwealth Atlantic Land Company, and Commonwealth Atlantic Land V Inc.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Council of Environmental Quality regulations and National Park Service policy, the National Park Service has completed an EA which evaluated the potential impacts of the proposed exchange of land interests associated with two distinct properties located in the City of Alexandria and in Arlington County, Virginia. The EA examines the environmental and visual impacts of the land exchange on the resources and scenic quality of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The National Park Service is soliciting comments on this EA. These comments will be considered in evaluating it and in making decisions pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act.

DATES: There will be a 30-day public review period for comment on this document. Comments on the EA should be received no later than June 30, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comment on the EA should be submitted to Mr. John G. Parsons, Associate Regional Director, Lands, Resources, and Planning, National Park Service, National Capital Region, 1100 Ohio Drive, SW, Washington, DC 20242. A limited number of copies of the EA are available on request. A public reading copy of the EA will be available at the National Capital Region Headquarters Building, 1100 Ohio Drive, SW, First Floor Lobby, Washington, DC 20242, and at the National Park Service Planning web page at nps.gov/gwmp/landexchange.htm.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John G. Parsons, Associate Regional Director, Lands, Resources, and Planning, National Park Service, National Capital Region, 1100 Ohio Drive, SW, Washington, DC 20242, Telephone: (202) 619–7025.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: By virtue of an Indenture land agreement dated February 12, 1938, the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad Company (RF&P), predecessor in title to Commonwealth, conveyed to the United States certain land use restrictions over 29.1 acres of land in Arlington County, Virginia, currently owned by Commonwealth and hereinafter referenced as ''the Indenture Land.''

Commonwealth also owns 38.55 acres of land in the City of Alexandria, Virginia, hereinafter referenced as ''Potomac Greens.'' By virtue of a Deed of Easement dated August 13, 1984, and in accordance with the terms of a previous exchange agreement between the United States and RF&P, the United States conveyed to RF&P a perpetual easement on and across a portion of lands of the George Washington Memorial Parkway for access, including ingress and egress from the northbound and southbound lanes of the George Washington Memorial Parkway to and from Potomac Greens in return for RF&P's obligation to construct at no cost to the United States a center-piered bridge and all associated ramps and connections necessary for ingress and egress to and from Potomac Greens to the George Washington Memorial Parkway and other valuable consideration.

Commonwealth is desirous of the United States relinquishing its restrictions on the Indenture Land in order to allow Commonwealth to implement a proposed plan for the mixed use development of the property in exchange for certain restrictions to be conveyed by Commonwealth to the United States relative to building heights and setbacks. Commonwealth has also proposed implementing a plan for the residential development of Potomac Greens, including minimal support retail.

The National Park Service is desirous of acquiring Commonwealth's access rights to the George Washington Memorial Parkway and in return is willing to partially relinquish the United States' interests in restricting the use of the Indenture Land.

The National Park Service published a notice in the **Federal Register** on December 9, 1998 (63 FR 67916), inviting public comment on proposed land exchange. A public meeting was held on December 10, 1998, and as a result received six comments on the proposed exchange.

Dated: June 1, 1999.

Terry R. Carlstrom,

Regional Director, National Capital Region.

[FR Doc. 99–14439 Filed 6–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Record of Decision, General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, Isle Royale National Park, Keweenaw County, Michigan

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, and the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1505.2), the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, has prepared a Record of Decision on the Final General Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement for Isle Royale National Park, Keweenaw County, Michigan.

DATES: The Regional Director, Midwest Region approved the Record of Decision, on May 11, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent, Isle Royale National Park, 800 E. Lakeshore Drive, Houghton, MI 49931–1895, telephone 906–482–0986.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Introduction

The National Park Service has prepared the Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (GMP/FEIS) for Isle Royale National Park, Michigan. The GMP/FEIS proposes management direction for the park for the next 15–20 years and documents the anticipated effects of the proposed action and other alternatives on the human environment, including natural and cultural resources. This Record of Decision is a concise statement of the decisions made, other alternatives considered, the basis for the decision, the environmentally preferable alternative, and the mitigating measures developed to avoid or minimize environmental harm.

Decision

After careful consideration of environmental impacts, costs, comments from the public, agencies, and tribes, and engineering evaluations, the National Park Service recommends

for implementation the proposed action evaluated in the final general management plan/environmental impact statement.

Summary of the Selected Action

The goal of the selected alternative, which was identified as the proposed action in the Final Environmental Statement, is to meet the diverse expectations and needs of Isle Royale visitors while emphasizing the natural quiet that is fundamental to wilderness experiences. All park areas will be available to all visitors, so long as users participate in ways that are consistent with the access, facilities, and opportunities provided. Management zones will provide guidance for managing specific areas for desired visitor experience and resource conditions (see p. 30 of the GMP/FEIS).

Campgrounds will be designed and access provided to separate motorized and non-motorized uses in a few areas; certain docks will be removed or relocated, for example, and some new campgrounds will be provided. A variety of uses will be available that will be fairly evenly distributed across the island. Use limits may become necessary in some management zones to prevent overcrowding and maintain quiet and solitude. Quiet/no-wake water zones will be established to reduce noise and wake impacts in numerous areas. Other regulations aimed at reducing sound associated with humans will also be implemented.

Partnerships will be sought to maintain the docks and cultural resources at Barnum and Washington Islands. Potential adaptive public overnight use of these historic sites and former commercial fishing sites at Crystal Cove, Wright Island, and Fisherman's Home will be considered. When the Passage Island, Isle Royale, and Rock of Ages lighthouses are transferred to the NPS, partners will be sought to help stabilize, maintain, and interpret them and their surroundings.

Existing motel units at Rock Harbor will be reconfigured and made more rustic. Existing Housekeeping cabins will be retained; a few new rustic cabins will be added. Utility systems and other concession infrastructure at Rock Harbor will be brought into compliance with State and Federal standards. The dining room, concession laundry, and public laundry at Rock Harbor will be discontinued; most other concession services will remain. Unless the concessioner is subsidized through a new congressional appropriation, prices of services might rise to the point that concessions services may be unviable.

In addition to the actions described above, the following actions are part of the selected alternative and alternatives B, C, and E (described in the next section). Actions related to natural resources: complete baseline inventories of natural resources, expand monitoring, develop fisheries management and water resource management plans, and establish research and wolf management advisory boards. Actions related to cultural resources: complete inventory and documentation of resources, expand monitoring, research specific cultural history gaps, and cooperate with partners to set standards for and carry out shipwreck preservation. Except in alternative C, historic structures would generally be retained if they were eligible for the National Register and a potential use was identified. Actions related to interpretation, information, and education: develop a comprehensive interpretive plan, improve visitor information facilities, strengthen education outreach, and develop interpretive media supportive of park emphasis statements. Other actions: develop a wilderness and backcountry management plan and a commercial services plan, limit charter fishing permits, prohibit personal watercraft, and perform a study to develop and evaluate options for improving the mainland headquarters.

Other Alternatives Considered

Alternative A—Alternative A (the status quo or no-action alternative) would continue current management at Isle Royale National Park. It provides a baseline for evaluating the changes and related environmental effects of the other alternatives. Park managers would continue to provide for visitor use and would respond to natural and cultural resource management concerns according to current policy and legal requirements and as funding allowed. There would be no change in management direction.

Alternative B—Alternative B would separate uses by concentrating facilities and services at the ends of the island and by creating an increasingly primitive wilderness experience toward the middle of the island. Visitors would find a full range of facilities and services and a more structured experience at Rock Harbor and Windigo, the primary access points to the island, which would both require some increased development. A more primitive wilderness experience with quiet and solitude would be found toward the center of the island, where most facilities and amenities would be removed. Limits on the number of visitors there would probably be necessary.

In addition to orientation and interpretation offered at the Houghton headquarters, a broad range of services would be available at both ends of the island. Rock Harbor and Windigo would offer a full range of orientation information and services. No formal interpretation would be offered in the middle of the island.

Some cultural resources in developed and frontcountry zones could be preserved through adaptive use for lodging, interpretation, or operations. Cultural resources toward the middle of the island would be documented and allowed to deteriorate.

Additional staff and housing might be needed at Windigo to operate expanded sewer and water treatment facilities. The Amygdaloid Island ranger station would remain, but the Malone Bay station in the middle of the island would be removed.

Alternative C—Most of the island would be truly primitive. Emphasis would be placed on providing superlative wilderness experiences, solitude, and escape from the intrusions of the modern world. Facilities and development would be scaled back and evidence of management activities would be minimal. Party size would be limited to a maximum of six people for overnight use on the island.

Visitation would be managed through a reservation system. Permits could be issued on a first-come, first-served basis, or a lottery system would be used. Various systems would be carefully evaluated before one was chosen.

Emphasis would be placed on providing orientation and interpretation at the Houghton headquarters and other ferry staging areas. Additional information would be provided in written materials. No interpretive media or formal programs would be offered on the island because they could intrude on the wilderness character.

Ferry service would be provided to Rock Harbor and Windigo only. Water taxi service would be eliminated.

Consistent with the concept of this alternative, all cultural resources would be documented and allowed to decay. No stabilization or preservation of these resources would be attempted. The Coast Guard would continue to maintain navigational aids, and the National Park Service would continue to maintain access to these areas; however, when the lighthouses are turned over to the National Park Service, they would be documented and allowed to decay. Lighthouses could be maintained, however, by the Coast Guard or some other entity.

Alternative E—Most facilities would remain and services would continue, but a few changes would be made to better separate uses and increase interpretation. To provide better quality experiences without restricting activities, visitor numbers would be controlled at substantially lower levels than exist now (10,000 to 13,000 people per year). This would mean that approximately 5,000 to 8,000 fewer visitors per year would be accommodated than in recent years.

Visitation to the island would be managed through a reservation system. A limited number of permits could be issued per year on a first-come, first-served basis, or there could be a lottery system or some other method. Various reservation systems would be carefully evaluated before one was chosen.

Interpreted sites would remain, and historic structures at Wright Island, Crystal Cove, and Fishermans Home could be adaptively used for additional interpretation of park cultural themes. Interpretation and environmental education could be provided at the west end of the park at Washington and Barnum Islands. The Rock Harbor and Windigo areas would remain the primary visitor orientation points.

Historic structures and landscapes would be preserved in priority order according to significance. The historic commercial fishery sites at Wright Island, Crystal Cove, and Fishermans Home would be stabilized and adaptive uses would be sought to provide for their continued preservation and interpretation. When the National Park Service received title to the lighthouses owned by the U.S. Coast Guard, partners interested in preserving the structures would be considered.

Environmentally Preferable Alternative

The environmentally preferable alternative is defined as ''the alternative or alternatives that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in section 101 of the National Environmental Policy Act. Ordinarily, this means the alternative that causes least damage to the biological and physical environment; it also means the alternative that best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources'' (''Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) National Environmental Policy Act Regulations,'' 1981).

The environmentally preferable alternative is the selected action. This alternative best meets the full range of national environmental policy goals as stated in NEPA's Section 101. The selected action (1) maximizes protection of natural and cultural resources while maintaining a wide range of neutral and beneficial uses of the environment without degradation; (2) maintains an environment that supports diversity and variety of individual choice; (3) achieves a balance between human population and resource use; and (4) improves resource sustainability.

Alternative C, as described in the Final GMP/EIS, could potentially provide additional protection for natural resources beyond that included in the selected action, primarily through scaling back human activities and facilities. Alternative C does not protect historic and cultural resources, however, nor does it provide for a diversity of human choice.

The selected alternative provides the appropriate balance and flexibility necessary to protect the cultural heritage and traditional recreational uses at Isle Royale, as well as natural and cultural resources. This approach is also vital to maintaining relationships between gateway communities and Isle Royale National Park, a critical element in the successful implementation of the proposed action and realization of its beneficial effects on the environment.

Measures To Minimize Harm

All practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm that could result from implementation of the selected action have been identified and incorporated into the selected action. They are presented in detail in the GMP/FEIS. They include, but are not limited to, resource monitoring and management; visitor use monitoring and management; commitments for additional resource surveys and consultation prior to Park Service construction, and proposals for additional research and data collection as outlined in the plan. Additional mitigation measures are discussed on pp. 24 and 25, and in the Consultation and Coordination section (pp. 128–134) of the GMP/FEIS.

Due to the programmatic nature of the general management plan, specific development projects will be reviewed as necessary for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, National Historic Preservation Act, and other applicable Federal and State laws and regulations prior to project clearance and implementation. Specific measures to minimize environmental harm will be included in implementation plans called for by the GMP/FEIS. These include fisheries management and water resource management plans, a study to develop and evaluate options for improving the mainland headquarters, a comprehensive interpretive plan, a wilderness and backcountry management plan, and a commercial services plan.

Basis For Decision

The selected alternative best supports the park's purpose, significance, and wilderness status, and accomplishes the statutory mission of the National Park Service to provide long-term protection of park resources while allowing for appropriate levels of visitor use and means of visitor enjoyment. The selected alternative also does the best job of addressing issues identified during public scoping while minimizing environmental harm. Other factors considered in the decision were public and resource benefits gained for the cost incurred, and extensive public comment.

Public Involvement

Public involvement for the General Management Plan began with a workshop for representatives of key stakeholders in February 1994. In July 1995 the planning team met on the island to discuss preliminary planning issues. Team members spoke about the planning effort at two public programs on the island. The planning team also met with park staff members (those not on the planning team) to solicit their input. Newsletter #1, published in November 1995, introduced the planning project and process to the public.

In Newsletter #2 the public was asked to review draft purpose and significance statements and a list of preliminary planning issues. Nearly 300 responses were received and 50–60 people attended each public meeting in Duluth, Minnesota, and Houghton and Lansing, Michigan to provide additional comments.

Newsletter #3, published in June 1996, summarized public input to date and presented revised purpose and significance statements, park emphasis statements, revised issue statements, potential management zones, and possible alternative concepts. There were again a large number of responses and the results were reported in November 1996 in Newsletter #4.

Using the public input, the planning team developed the alternative concepts in more detail and presented them with maps in Newsletter #5 in February 1997. Public meetings were held in Ann Arbor and Houghton, Michigan and Duluth, Minnesota, to present the management alternatives for public comment in March 1997. There was significant response to the newsletter and 75 to 150 people attended each meeting. Using

that input the planning team developed a preliminary preferred alternative, which was presented in Newsletter #6 in July 1997.

The Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was produced and distributed for public review in March 1998. Public meetings were held in April 1998 at St. Paul and Duluth, Minnesota, and Houghton and Ann Arbor, Michigan. Approximately 75–150 people attended each of the meetings. Additionally, nearly 600 responses were received by mail or on the Internet. The preferred alternative was subsequently revised and the Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was distributed in November 1998.

Sixteen (16) letters commenting on the GMP/FEIS were received. There were few new ideas expressed in the letters; similar comments (with NPS responses) were incorporated into the GMP/FEIS. Concerns related to the following general topic areas were expressed: separation of uses (including concerns about non-motorized zones), concessions services at Rock Harbor (including concerns about affordability and accessibility of overnight accommodations), and dock removal and replacement. The National Park Service has heard these concerns, and responded to them in the ''Summary of Public Comments'' section of the GMP/FEIS.

Conclusion

A notice of availability for the Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for Isle Royale National Park was published in the **Federal Register** on November 3, 1998, and the 30-day no-action period ended on December 3, 1998.

The above factors and considerations justify the selection of the final plan, as described in the ''Proposed Action'' section of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The final general management plan is hereby approved.

Dated: May 21, 1999.

William W. Schenk,

Regional Director.

[FR Doc. 99–14440 Filed 6–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park, New Orleans, Louisiana; Notice of Availability of Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park

SUMMARY: This Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement describes and analyzes three alternatives proposed by the National Park Service for setting park management and direction for New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park over the next 10 to 15 years. The format of the document will be as an abbreviated final environmental impact statement. **Alternative A** is the no-action, or status quo, alternative. This alternative would not allow the park to achieve its mission; however, it does provide a baseline for comparison with the other alternatives. **Alternative B** would emphasize conveying the park's interpretive story through such personal programs as interpreted performances, seminars, and performances. Educational activities would be given maximum emphasis in this alternative. It would allow the park to assist in the adaptive use of structures related to jazz. Interpretive programming would heavily depend on the involvement of local musicians and educators, thus supporting cultural preservation. Under this alternative, the visitor center would be located at the Old U.S. Mint. **Alternative C** would emphasize a strong partnership program between the National Park Service and other entities involved in preserving the New Orleans jazz tradition. In Alternative C, the National Park Service would provide funding for basic park operations and would work intensively with others to develop partnerships and alternative funding sources for interpretation, visitor use and experiences, and other activities focusing on preserving the jazz tradition. The extent and success of this alternative would depend on substantial support from partners, especially the private sector. Interpretation media would be extensively used, and the size and scope of park educational and preservation programs would be guided by the development of partnerships. Under this alternative, the visitor center would be located at a complex in Louis Armstrong Park. Alternative C is the National Park Service's **Proposed Action**.

Environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the alternatives are addressed in the document. Impact topics include cultural and natural resources, interpretation and visitor use, socioeconomic environment, and National Park Service operations. Measures that would be taken to mitigate impacts are also described in the document.

Availability: The Final Environmental Impact Statement is being mailed to agencies, organizations, and individuals on the park's mailing list, and a limited number of copies will be available at park headquarters at the following address: Superintendent, New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park, 365 Canal Street, Suite 2400, New Orleans, LA 70130, Telephone (504) 589–4806.

No sooner than 30 days from the appearance of this notice in the **Federal Register**, a Record of Decision will be signed that will document NPS approval of the general management plan for New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park, and identify the selected action from the alternatives presented in the FEIS.

Dated: May 28, 1999.

W. Thomas Brown,

Acting Regional Director, Southeast Region.

[FR Doc. 99–14441 Filed 6–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Racial Desegregation of Public Education National Historic Landmark Theme Study

AGENCY: National Park Service.

ACTION: Notice of theme study.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that in October 1998, Congress authorized the National Park Service to prepare a National Historic Landmark (NHL) Theme Study on the history of racial desegregation in public education in the United States. The purpose of this study is to develop a historic context on the story of racial desegregation and to identify and prioritize potential National Historic Landmarks This study will be presented to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior in October 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Sprinkle, National Register, History, and Education (2280), National Park Service, 1849 C Street, NW, Room NC–400, Washington, DC 20240. Telephone (202) 343–8166.