

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SUMMARY: The park is operating with an outdated 1966 Master Plan that is not consistent with current National Park Service policies.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