

a moving and eloquent place where visitors can examine for themselves the meaning of the American Civil War and its relevance in the modern world.

Protection and interpretation of the battlefield resources around Richmond has engendered debates about where, how much, and by whom since the local citizenry began the push for battlefield preservation early this century. In 1927 the Richmond Battlefield Parks Corporation began assembling the original battlefield acreage; and in 1932 the corporation deeded all of its property to the Commonwealth of Virginia to become Virginia's first state park—the Richmond Battlefield State Park. That same year, a study done by the Secretary of War for the U.S. Congress determined that these acres were appropriate for acquisition by the War Department should they be offered for donation. The War Department study further recommended that an additional 1,905 acres of core battlefield land be purchased. The donation was ultimately accepted by federal authorities, but the recommendation regarding additional land acquisition was not acted upon. In 1993 the Congressionally chartered Civil War Sites Advisory Commission submitted its report that highlighted seven (7) battlefields around Richmond in the list of the fifty most significant and most threatened battlefields in the country. This Plan is consistent with the recommendations of the Commission.

Other Alternatives Considered: Three other alternatives to the selected action were considered: (1). Under the no-action alternative, the park would continue to have amorphously defined boundaries that include large portions of developed land and would emphasize recreational development. This alternative was defined by the 1971 Park Master Plan and supporting implementation plans. The interpretive ideas were to deemphasize battle tactics and explain the Civil War in general in Richmond with no attempt to lead visitors on an interpretive theme from one site to another. Chimborazo would revert to the City while a new visitor center and headquarters would be constructed at Fort Harrison; (2) The first development option would create a new visitor center in downtown Richmond and deemphasize battlefield preservation. Interpretation would emphasize the importance of the Confederate capital, and visitors would be directed to a wide range of surviving Civil War resources in the metropolitan Richmond area; (3) The other development option would emphasize an expanded battlefield land protection and cultural/natural landscape scene restoration effort. The visitor center

would be located adjacent to a battlefield, and interpretation would emphasize the military actions to take the city.

Measures to Minimize Impacts and Address Public Concerns: The environmental consequences of the proposed action and the other alternatives were fully documented in the DEIS and are re-presented with modifications in the FEIS. The public review period on the DEIS ended October 2, 1995. The "Affected Environment" section that follows the alternatives described the park's surroundings and community context, the current visitor experience, existing cultural and natural resources, and current park operations and administration. In the Environmental Consequences section the proposal and alternatives are analyzed for their general and specific impacts on the visitor experience, resource protection, park administration, and the surrounding community.

The results of public comment on the DEIS are included in the FEIS. A major concession on the part of the National Park Service was to eliminate objectionable provisions of the power of eminent domain and to propose to buy land from willing sellers only. Further, the Savage Station battlefield and parts of the Totopotomoy Creek battlefield were dropped from the proposed boundary. The main Visitor Center is planned to remain at Chimborazo and partnerships with the private and public sectors pursued to augment visitor services to establish a Civil War center in Richmond.

Also in response to public comment, this action reaffirms the NPS commitment to battlefield resource protection and responds actively to the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission report to Congress recommending federal involvement at certain battlefields. Changes in the park's enabling legislation would be sought to authorize the appropriation and expenditure of federal funds for the purchase of battlefield lands, including specific tracts outside the existing legislative boundary. These changes will enable RNPB to be a more effective steward and partner with private interests and local and state governments to protect the principal Civil War resources associated with the long and difficult struggle for the capital of the Confederacy and to interpret these resources so as to foster an understanding of their significance as parts of a whole. If the legislation is not enacted, the plan will be able to be effected except that property would be

acquired only through the use of donations.

The no-action period on this final plan and environmental impact statement ended September 9, 1996, thirty (30) days after the publication of a notice of availability in the Federal Register.

Environmentally Preferable Action: The environmentally preferred alternative is the one that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment. It is the alternative that best protects, preserves and enhances the historic, cultural, and natural resources of the area where the proposed action is to take place.

The proposal is the alternative the best fits the definition. This Plan will best protect resources cultural and natural.

Conclusion: The above factors and considerations justify selection of the preferred alternative as the General Management Plan for the Richmond National Battlefield Park as identified and detailed in the final EIS.

Park personnel will begin working with local and state officials, the private sector, other staff of the National Park Service, and the Congress of the United States to implement the plan.

Dated: November 25, 1996.

Cynthia MacLeod,
Superintendent, Richmond National
Battlefield Park, (804) 226-1981.

Dated: November 26, 1996.

Warren D. Beach,
Assistant Field Director, Northeast Field Area,
(215) 597-7013.

[FR Doc. 96-30702 Filed 12-5-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement for Keweenaw National Historical Park, Michigan

ACTION: Notice of Intent to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the General Management Plan for Keweenaw National Historical Park, Michigan.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Park Service, Department of the Interior will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement to assess the potential impacts of future development and management options in conjunction with the General Management Plan for Keweenaw National Historical Park, Michigan.

Preparation of a draft General Management Plan began in 1995 and included preparation of a draft Environmental Assessment. Scoping for

the plan has included interdisciplinary team meetings with the Keweenaw National Historical Park Advisory Commission, interested agencies, organizations, and individuals. Meetings with the general public were conducted in February and May, 1995. The scoping process has indicated that the proposals being considered may result in significant impacts to the human environment and may constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Therefore, the preparation of an EIS in conjunction with the plan is appropriate.

The General Management Plan and EIS will investigate alternatives ranging from no action to a variety of development and management proposals designed to guide visitor use, resource protection, and partnership relationships. Federal, State and local agencies, and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in, or affected by, the future development of Keweenaw National Historical Park are further invited to participate in refining or identifying issues. Written comments and suggestions concerning preparation of the EIS should be sent to: Superintendent, Keweenaw National Historical Park, 100 Red Jacket Road (2nd floor), Calumet, Michigan 49913. William Schenk, Field Director for the Midwest Field Area in Omaha, Nebraska is the responsible official.

Preparation of the plan and EIS is expected to take about 12 months. The draft plan and EIS should be available for public review by spring, 1997 with the final plan and EIS and Record of Decision expected to be completed by fall, 1997. Schedules for public meetings to solicit comments on the draft plan will be announced at the time of plan completion.

Dated: November 22, 1996.
William W. Schenk,
Field Director, Midwest Field Area.
[FR Doc. 96-31120 Filed 12-5-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

[F.C.S.C. Meeting Notice No. 11-96]

Sunshine Act Meeting

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, pursuant to its regulations (45 CFR Part 504) and the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b), hereby gives notice in regard to the scheduling of meetings and oral

hearings for the transaction of Commission business and other matters specified, as follows:

Date and Time: Mon., December 16, 1996, 10:00 a.m.

Subject Matter: 1. Consideration of Proposed Decisions on claims against Albania

2. Oral Hearing on objection to Proposed Decision in the following claim against Albania:

ALB-216—Rita Deto Sefla

3. Hearings on the record on objections to Proposed Decisions in the following claims against Albania:

ALB-155—Near East Foundation

ALB-163—Zakije Florence Lika

ALB-202—Nazmi Araniti

ALB-217—Arthur Generalis

Status: Open

Subject matter not disposed of at the scheduled meeting may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

All meetings are held at the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, 600 E Street, NW., Washington, DC. Requests for information, or advance notices of intention to observe an open meeting may be directed to: Administrative Officer, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, 600 E Street, NW., Room 6029, Washington, DC 20579. Telephone: (202) 616-6988.

Dated at Washington, DC, December 4, 1996.

Judith H. Lock,

Administrative Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-31243 Filed 12-4-96; 2:13 pm]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-P

[F.C.S.C. Meeting Notice No. 12-96]

Sunshine Act Meeting

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, pursuant to its regulations (45 CFR Part 504) and the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b), hereby gives notice in regard to the scheduling of meetings and oral hearings for the transaction of Commission business and other matters specified, as follows:

Date and Time: Mon., December 16, 1996, approximately 11:30 a.m.

Subject Matter: Consideration of Proposed Decisions on claims of Holocaust survivors against Germany.

Status: Closed.

All meetings are held at the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, 600 E Street, NW., Washington, DC. Requests for information, or advance notices of intention to observe an open meeting may be directed to: Administrative Officer, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, 600 E Street, NW., Room

6029, Washington, DC 20579. Telephone: (202) 616-6988.

Dated at Washington, DC, December 4, 1996.

Judith H. Lock,

Administrative Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-31244 Filed 12-4-96; 2:13 pm]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-P

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Agency Information Collection Activities: Extension of Existing Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice of information collection under review; application for advance permission to return to unrelinquished domicile.

Office of Management and Budget approval is being sought for the information collection listed below. This proposed information collection was previously published in the Federal Register on August 14, 1996, at 61 FR 42270, allowing for a 60-day public comment period. No comments were received by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments until January 6, 1997. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR Part 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Office, Washington, DC 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to (202) 395-7285. Comments may also be submitted to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Information Management and Security Staff, Attention: Department Clearance Officer, Suite 850, 1001 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to DOJ via facsimile to (202) 514-1534.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the