

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.