

publications for use by private organizations and other Government agencies.

Bureau form number: 6-1109-MA.

Frequency: Monthly and Annual.

Description of respondents:

Operations that consume ferrous metals.

Estimated completion time: 45 minutes.

Annual responses: 3,656.

Annual burden hours: 2,742.

Bureau clearance officer: Alice J.

Floyd, 202-501-9569.

Dated: June 9, 1995.

K.W. Mlynarski,

Acting Chief, Division of Statistics and Information Services.

[FR Doc. 95-18427 Filed 7-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-53-M

National Park Service

General Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement Grand Canyon National Park Coconino and Mohave Counties, Arizona; Availability

Introduction: Pursuant to 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Pub. L. 91-190, as amended), the Department of the Interior, National Park Service (NPS), has prepared a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and General Management Plan (GMP) that describe and analyze a proposed action and four alternatives for the future management, use, and development of Grand Canyon National Park.

Public Review Comments: Two hundred and forty comment letters were received on the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) during a 60-day period ending May 11, 1995. In addition, four public meetings were held during March 25-29, 1995 in various locations in Arizona and Utah. Approximately 1,400 copies of the DEIS/GMP were distributed during the public review period. The FEIS/GMP incorporates modifications and clarifications in response to some of these public comments. The same proposed action and same four alternatives were evaluated in both the DEIS/GMP and the FEIS/GMP.

Proposed and Alternative Actions: The GMP proposed for adoption provides specific management objectives and visions for the entire park, as well as general regional-ecosystem management objectives and visions. The proposed action, the no-action alternative, and three other alternatives, and their environmental consequences, were identified and analyzed as follows:

Proposed Action: The "proposed action" (Alternative 2) emphasizes regional cooperation for information distribution, regional resource preservation, and a quality visitor experience. A major shift away from the use of private automobiles would occur. Alternate modes of transportation would be emphasized throughout the region and within the park, with staging areas linked to regional private transit services in outlying communities and a public transit system within the park. Private vehicles would be removed from the heaviest use areas in the park, creating pedestrian-only areas. The number of private vehicles allowed into the park at any one time would be limited in certain areas. The adaptive use of historic structures and other structures would be maximized. To minimize resource impacts, construction of new park facilities would be almost entirely within disturbed areas. The visitor experience would be defined by the unique qualities of each individual area, and the number of visitors allowed into some areas of the park would be determined by a carrying capacity analysis. With respect to environmental consequences, the proposed action would stabilize the growth of infrastructure within the park, enhance natural and cultural resource preservation, improve significantly the visitor experience, create better living and working conditions for park employees, and benefit local economies.

Under the Plan proposed for adoption, the regional context of Grand Canyon National Park would be emphasized, and proposals for resource preservation and visitor use would take into account environmental effects on both the park and the region. Cooperative planning efforts outside the park would emphasize disseminating information, preserving regional and park resources, and providing a quality visitor experience. The NPS would work jointly with adjacent entities to provide for many park needs outside park boundaries. The most appropriate locations for facilities would be considered in a regional context, taking into consideration principles of sustainable design and the need to preserve resources while providing for a quality visitor experience.

The number of visitors in certain areas would be limited during peak visitation periods based on desired visitor experience and identified resource protection needs, according to the monitoring program called for in the plan. The process for determining use limits would be the same throughout the developed areas of the park. However,

visitor levels in specific areas could vary considerably, and use may be limited sooner in some areas than others. South Rim day visitation would be unlimited during the life of this plan if all the proposed alternate transportation services are fully funded and operational in an appropriate time frame. If this does not occur, as a contingency measure day use reservations would be established for the South Rim during peak visitation periods (similar to Alternative 1). North Rim Day visitation would be limited by 2005 or 2010, depending on effectiveness of management actions. Day use at Tuweep could be limited at peak times. In areas where reservations became necessary, visitors would be able to reserve permits in advance, which would be subject to verifying at park entrances. Overnight accommodations would be expanded on the South and North Rims primarily by adaptively reusing existing structures.

To preserve resources and enhance visitor experience, most of the park's developed areas would be accessible only by public transit, hiking, or biking. Private vehicles (tour buses, cars, and RVs) would only be allowed in specific areas. The public transit, pedestrian, and bikeway system would be significantly expanded. The monitoring program called for would measure resource impacts, facility use, visitor satisfaction, and visitor attendance levels in each park developed area. The permit system would be adjusted as needed. To further provide a quality visitor experience, interpretive programs would focus on significant resources of Grand Canyon, as well as regional conservation issues.

Alternatives Considered: The four other alternatives analyzed include: continuing existing programs and conditions (the no-action alternative), a minimum requirements alternative (alternative 1), reduced park development (alternative 3), and increased park development (alternative 4). They are as follows:

Under the "No-Action" alternative (continuing existing programs and conditions), planning would be focused within the park, primarily to solve existing problems. Issues related to planning and land management practices in areas immediately outside the park would be handled individually as the need arose, without an overall area vision or cooperative regional planning effort to guide the direction. Cooperative planning to distribute regional information to visitors would be limited. Visitation would continue in all park developed areas, with nearly every South Rim visitor facility

continuing to be overcapacity during peak use periods. No major facilities would be built, and no major park functions would be relocated. Any required facility changes would be done in or adjacent to existing disturbed areas. The number of overnight accommodations, campsites, and all other visitor services would remain the same in each developed area. Minor adjustments in management would be made to help reduce resource damage and to provide a safer visitor experience.

Under the "Minimum Requirements" alternative (Alternative 1), planning would be focused within the park (similar to the No-Action alternative). Issues related to planning and land management in areas adjacent to the park would be individually handled as the need arose, without overall area vision or an integrated regional planning effort to give direction. Unlimited day visitation would continue in all park developed areas until visitor congestion, resource damage, and public safety warranted restricting peak visitation access. This would be accomplished by implementing reservation systems based on capacity of existing parking and eating facilities on the South and North Rims. Regional information programs would explain the park's reservation systems to visitors. Overnight accommodations would not be affected. Visitor use at Tuweep and on corridor trails would not be limited under this alternative. Existing land use patterns would be retained—no major facilities would be built, no major park functions would be relocated, and most park facilities would remain where they are now (some minor facilities would be added). Any required facility changes would be accomplished in or adjacent to existing disturbed areas.

Under the "Reduced Park Development" alternative (Alternative 3), planning for the park would be done in a regional context to minimize negative impacts resulting from park uses being placed in areas outside the park. Communications would be expanded (as with Alternative 2). Wherever possible, facilities placed outside the park would be clustered in disturbed areas and linked to existing systems. Preserving the park's natural and cultural resources would be emphasized; many disturbed areas would be rehabilitated. Alternate modes of transportation would be emphasized regionally as well as in major park high use areas (as with Alternative 2). Park resources would be preserved by placing all new facilities and relocating many existing functions outside the

park. Cooperative regional planning would ensure that NPS functions occurring outside park boundaries featured sustainable planning and design. The NPS would expand its regional information services (as with Alternative 2). On the South Rim all day visitor vehicles would be removed, and a major public transit system would be provided. No new lands within the park would be disturbed, and historic uses of existing structures would be retained wherever possible. Overnight accommodations would be reduced on the South Rim but increased on the North Rim by adaptively reusing historic structures.

Under the "Increased Park Development" alternative (Alternative 4), planning outside the park would emphasize regional information (as with Alternative 2). Cooperative planning with outside entities would focus on disseminating information, providing trip planning assistance, and distributing visitor use. Actions to improve visitor convenience would place major visitor services inside the park wherever reasonable, and visitors would be distributed throughout the park's developed areas. No day use limits would be established unless the visitor experience was significantly degraded. The type of vehicular use allowed in some areas would be restricted, and high use areas would be accessible only by transit vehicles or hiking or biking (as with Alternative 2). Other developed areas would be accessible by private vehicles. Overnight accommodations would be increased in all developed areas on the North and South Rims by adaptively reusing existing structures and constructing some new facilities (either in or adjacent to disturbed areas).

SUMMARY: Based upon the analysis in the DEIS, and taking into account all comments obtained from public meetings and received in writing from reviewers, Alternative 2 (as described in the DEIS and modified somewhat in the subject FEIS) is identified as the general management plan proposed to be adopted to guide future management of Grand Canyon National Park. The no action period on this FEIS will expire 30 days after Notice of its availability is published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the **Federal Register**.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A limited number of copies of the FEIS/GMP are available upon request from: Superintendent, Grand Canyon National Park, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, AZ 86023 (520)638-7945; or the Planning Team Leader, Grand Canyon General

Management Plan, National Park Service, TWE-Denver Service Center, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, CO 80225-0287 (303)969-2267.

As noted in the **Federal Register** Notice published March 13, 1995, the official responsible for a decision on the action proposed is the Regional Director, Western Regional Office, National Park Service. Subsequently, the officials responsible for implementing the approved plan are the Field Director, Intermountain Field Office, National Park Service and the Superintendent, Grand Canyon National Park.

Dated: July 12, 1995.

Stanley T. Albright,

Regional Director, Western Region.

[FR Doc. 95-18410 Filed 7-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

Richmond National Battlefield Park Draft General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement/Land Resource Protection Study

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality Regulations and National Park Service Policy, the National Park Service (NPS) announces the release of the Draft General Management Plan (Draft GMP/EIS/LRPS) for Richmond National Battlefield Park, Virginia.

DATES: The Draft GMP/EIS/LRPS will be on public review until September 30, 1995. All review comments must be postmarked no later than October 2, 1995. Open house public meetings will be held.

6:00-10:00 pm Wednesday, August 9,
1995—Laurel Hill United Methodist
Church, Fellowship Hall, 1991 New
Market Rd., Richmond, VA 23231

5:00-9:00 pm Thursday, August 10,
1995—Beulah Presbyterian Church,
7252 Beulah Church Rd.,
Mechanicsville, VA 23111

12:30-4:30 pm Friday, August 11,
1995—Chesterfield County
Historical Society, "Old
Courthouse" at the Administration
Complex, 10011 Iron Bridge Rd.,
Chesterfield, VA 23832

9:00 am-1:00 pm Saturday, August 12,
1995—St. John's Church Parish
Hall, 2401 E. Broad St., Richmond,
VA 23223

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft GMP/EIS/LRPS presents four alternatives for future management and use of Richmond National Battlefield Park.