

notice \* \* \* and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information \* \* \*

Agencies must specifically solicit comments to: (a) evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the agency to perform its duties, including whether the information is useful; (b) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) minimize the burden on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

We will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in our submission for OMB approval. As a result of your comments, we will make any necessary adjustments to the burden in our submission to OMB.

Dated: June 12, 2000.

**John V. Mirabella,**

*Acting Chief, Engineering and Operations Division.*

[FR Doc. 00-15801 Filed 6-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### Notice of Availability for a Draft General Management Plan Amendment/Environmental Impact Statement, Dry Tortugas National Park, Monroe County, FL

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190, as amended), the National Park Service (NPS) has prepared a Draft General Management Plan Amendment/Environmental Impact Statement (DGMPA/EIS) that evaluates five alternatives for Dry Tortugas National Park. The document describes and analyzes the environmental impacts of a proposed action, three action alternatives and a no-action alternative. When approved, the plan will guide management actions during the next 15-20 years. This document was completed in cooperation with the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. However, the National Park Service planning document and process are separate from the Marine Sanctuary's process and document.

**DATES:** There will be a 60-day public review period for comment on the draft document which will begin when the

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) publishes their notice in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Public reading copies of the DGMPA/EIS will be available for review at the following locations:

- Everglades National Park, 40001 State Road 9336, Homestead;
- Offices of Florida National Marine Sanctuary at 216 Ann Street, Key West; 5550 Overseas Highway, Marathon; and 95200 Overseas Highway, Key Largo;
- Miami-Dade Public Library, Homestead Branch, 700 N. Homestead boulevard, Homestead;
- Collier County Public Library, 650 Central Avenue, Naples; and
- St. Petersburg Public Library, 3745 9th Avenue North, St. Petersburg.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Notice of the availability of the final document will be published in the **Federal Register**. Subsequently, notice of an approved Record of Decision will be published in the **Federal Register** not sooner than 30 days after the final document is distributed. The official responsible for the decision is the Regional Director, Southeast Region, National Park Service; the official responsible for implementation is the Superintendent, Dry Tortugas National Park.

In order to facilitate the review process, public meetings will be held from 3 p.m. to 8 p.m. in the following Florida locations:

- Homestead Senior High School, S.E. 12th Avenue, Homestead—June 12;
- Comfort Inn Executive Suites, 3860 Toll Gate Boulevard, Naples—June 13;
- University of South Florida at St. Petersburg, Campus Activities Center, 2nd Street and 6th Avenue South, St. Petersburg—June 14;
- The Sombrero Country Club, 4000 Sombrero Boulevard, Marathon—June 21;
- Holiday Inn Beach Side, 3841 North Roosevelt Boulevard, Key West—June 22.

A public meeting also will be held in Washington, DC from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. in the first floor HCHB Auditorium of the U.S. Commerce Building on July 11, 2000.

For the convenience of the public, these meetings will be held jointly with the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Detailed information for each public meeting will be published in local and regional newspapers in advance, broadcast via radio and television stations, and listed on the park's Webpage. Dry Tortugas National Park management and planning officials will attend all

sessions to present the draft document, to receive oral and written comments, and to answer questions.

Comments on the DGMPA/EIS should be received (or transmitted by e-mail) no later than 60 days after publication of EPA's **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may be submitted to Superintendent Richard G. Ring, Everglades National Park and Dry Tortugas National Park, 40001 State Road, 9336, Homestead, Florida 33034 or e-mailed to [jeffery\\_scott@nps.gov](mailto:jeffery_scott@nps.gov).

All comments received will be available for public review at Everglades National Park. If individuals submitting comments request that their name and/or address be withheld from public disclosure, it will be honored to the extent allowable by law. Such requests must be stated prominently in the beginning of the comments. There also may be circumstances wherein the NPS will withhold a respondent's identity as allowable by law. As always, NPS will make available for public inspection all submissions from organizations or businesses and from persons identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations and businesses. Anonymous comments may not be considered.

In addition, the document will be posted on the Dry Tortugas National Park Webpage ([www.nps.gov/dtrto/](http://www.nps.gov/dtrto/)). A limited number of printed copies will be available on request.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jeffery Scott, Supervisory Community Planner, Everglades National Park, 40001 State Road 9336, Homestead, Florida 33034, (Phone: 305-242-7706; FAX: 305-242-7711; email: [jeffery\\_scott@nps.gov](mailto:jeffery_scott@nps.gov)).

Dated: June 14, 2000.

**Daniel W. Brown,**

*Acting Regional Director, Southeast Region.*

[FR Doc. 00-15729 Filed 6-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### Final Environmental Impact Statement and Fort Baker Plan, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Marin County, California; Notice of Approved Record of Decision

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to § 102 (2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Pub. L. 91-190, as amended, and the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1505.2), the Department of the Interior, National Park Service (NPS) has prepared the Fort Baker Plan and

Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and approved a Record of Decision. This decision amends the 1980 Golden Gate National Recreation Area General Management Plan (GMP) as it pertains to Fort Baker, in accord with the "Proposed Action" alternative described and analyzed in the Fort Baker Plan Draft and Final EIS. The U.S. Department of Defense will transfer Fort Baker lands still under military ownership in 2001 to the NPS. The express intent of the selected Plan is to transform Fort Baker from a military installation to a new unit of the National Park System through a series of coordinated actions consistent with the National Park mission. The Fort Baker Plan Draft EIS was issued in October 1998 for a 60-day public review and comment period, and the Final EIS was released in October 1999. The 30-day no action period concluded on December 5, 1999.

### Project Background

In general, Public Law 92-589 established the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) so as to preserve for public use and enjoyment many outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values, as well as to maintain needed recreational open space deemed scarce in the urban environment. In particular, and according to 16 USC 460bb(2), " \* \* \* the easterly half of Fort Baker in Marin County, California shall remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. When the property is determined by the Department of Defense to be in excess of its needs, it shall be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary for purposes of this Act."

In 1995, the remaining military land at Fort Baker was determined to be excess to the needs of the military by the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure Committee and was required to be transferred to the NPS, consistent with Public Law 92-589, by the year 2001.

The Fort Baker site includes a Historic District listed on the National Register of Historic Places, a marina and waterfront area, and open space, scenic, and natural areas including habitat for the federally listed endangered mission blue butterfly. The NPS must provide for the reuse of Fort Baker as a new unit of the National Park System consistent with the requirements of Public Law 92-589, and with the Organic Act of 1916 which established that:

The fundamental purpose of all units of the National Park Service is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner

and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

In keeping with these authorities, § 1.2 of the Final EIS stated that the over-arching purpose of the conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process was to identify: (i) A program and types of uses that would be accommodated in historic buildings and would generate adequate revenue for building rehabilitation and preservation; (ii) Public use improvements, including new construction and removal of buildings, landscape treatments, trails, parking, circulation, and locations and patterns of use; (iii) Waterfront improvements; (iv) Opportunities for habitat restoration; and (v) An approach to the protection, rehabilitation and maintenance of the historic and natural resources.

### Alternatives Considered

Three "action" alternatives and a "no-action" alternative were analyzed in the Draft and Final EIS. The "action" alternatives were developed and refined through a public, three-year conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process and included, in addition to the selected action (described in the Draft and Final EIS as the Proposed Action), a 1980 GMP Alternative and an Office and Cultural Center Alternative.

The *Selected Action* envisions preserving historic structures and natural features through selection of compatible uses and rehabilitation, restoration and other site improvements. A conference and retreat center is to be created in historic buildings around the parade ground and in the adjacent nonhistoric Capehart area. This essential facility will be the smallest possible, economically viable complex capable of fulfilling Plan objectives (and will be designed to be compatible with the setting).

The Bay Area Discovery Museum is to be retained and expanded into historic buildings and new, compatibly designed structures within its campus. The Coast Guard Station will also be retained, and could accept a modest expansion for meeting-training space or staff quarters. The historic boat shop is to be used as a public center with meeting and program space, and supporting visitor amenities. The marina is to be converted to a public (non-membership) facility serving up to 60 boats through a combination of moorings-slips for day or overnight use. Docks are to be provided for the Coast Guard to use for mooring of disabled rescued boats, and for other NPS programs.

Restoration or enhancement of over 40 acres of natural habitat, including habitat for the federally endangered mission blue butterfly will be accomplished. The wooden bulkhead along the waterfront is to be removed and the beach restored, with an adjoining 6 acres of meadow, a picnic area and boardwalk. Fishing pier improvements include fish-cleaning stations, railings and benches. The batteries and other fortification structures are to be stabilized, preserved and interpreted (Battery Cavallo will be subject to a separate plan and environmental analysis). An NPS visitor center is to be established and an interpretive trail created from Lime Point along the waterfront, continuing as the San Francisco Bay Trail to East Road, Battery Duncan and the chapel.

The *GMP Alternative* was derived from the 1980 GMP. Key elements included: conference center to accommodate 350 people; a 200-bed youth hostel and artists-in-residence program in historic buildings around the Parade Ground; a 700-car parking lot serving a Marin Headlands shuttle (on a site created by removing 23 nonhistoric structures); and separate NPS maintenance facility and visitor center. The Bay Area Discovery Museum and Coast Guard Station would be retained with no features added. Historic boat shop and marina use would be similar to the Selected Action, with 50 slips provided for short-term public mooring. Historic fortifications would be preserved, and an environmental study and overnight campsite established near Battery Cavallo. Waterfront treatments would also be similar, though a more urban landscape is envisioned and a ferry landing would be installed at the fishing pier.

Under the *Office and Cultural Center Alternative*, the historic Parade Ground buildings would be used for offices, meeting and program space, performance space, and restaurant/food service space. Some nonhistoric residential structures would be used for residences, and others would be removed to provide parking for the center. The Bay Area Discovery Museum and Coast Guard expansion would be the same as under the Selected Action. The marina would be retained with both long-term and some short-term public mooring provided and public program and activity space provided in the boat shop. Treatment of the waterfront, fishing pier, open space, natural habitats and historic fortifications would be the same as under the Selected Action.

The *No Action Alternative* would continue existing management. Minimal

repairs to existing historic structures, infrastructure and other facilities would occur. Historic residential buildings would be leased for residential use, and other historic buildings would remain vacant with minimal repair. No restoration of the cultural landscape (or beach and waterfront area) and no new mission blue butterfly habitat work would be undertaken. Although visitor use effects (traffic, air emissions, etc.) could be lower under this alternative, benefits of the other "action" alternatives associated with habitat restoration, preservation and restoration of historic resources and the cultural landscape, recreational use and enjoyment by the American public, and beneficial visual effects would not occur.

### Public Involvement

Following the 1995 closure announcement, the NPS initiated a public planning effort to develop concepts for future use and preservation of the site and its resources. Beginning December 1995, a framework for the planning process was developed in consultation with local planning agencies and the public, and then presented to the GGNRA Advisory Commission in January 1996 for additional comment.

The public scoping phase was formalized through a notice published in the **Federal Register** on August 19, 1997. The scoping phase included an evaluation of the 1980 GMP so as to refine goals and objectives for a new Fort Baker Plan. The original vision for land uses and programs was reviewed within the context of current site conditions and new recreational and educational uses which were emerging. The originally envisioned land uses were scaled back, and some uses eliminated, with the intent of more effectively protecting the site's resources.

A Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on May 4, 1998. Over 50 public meetings, workshops, site tours, and hearings were held over the course of the EIS process. Thousands of public notices, planning updates and public input surveys were distributed to foster active public participation in developing and evaluating alternatives for the Fort Baker Plan. Various management concepts were assessed, and three "action" alternatives were carried forward for detailed evaluation in the EIS. Opportunities for public participation were also afforded through Draft EIS meetings, open houses, and presentations. Planning updates and opportunities for public comment were

also provided at more than 10 publicly noticed meetings of the GGNRA Advisory Commission.

During the 60-day public review period for the Draft EIS, 127 letters, e-mail messages, and oral comments at the November 18, 1998 GGNRA Advisory Commission were received. The NPS reviewed all comments, and integrated many of the public's recommendations into the Final EIS. Additional analysis of issues of concern and new or/and more refined mitigation measures were developed and included in the Final EIS in response to public comment.

The Final EIS was released on October 15, 1999, with over 200 copies distributed to interested members of the public and other agencies (it was available in paper and electronic format and posted on the park's website). The EPA notice of filing for the Final EIS appeared in the November 5, 1999 **Federal Register**, marking the beginning of the required 30-day no action period.

During this phase, an overview of the Final EIS was presented on November 16, 1999 to the GGNRA Advisory Commission. Of 28 people who provided oral comments, 20 people favored the Proposed Action and the public planning process used by the NPS to develop and refine the Fort Baker Plan EIS. Speakers included individuals and representatives of the National Parks and Conservation Association, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Marin Heritage, and the Bay Area Discovery Museum. Six people, including the chair of the Sausalito Citizens' Task Force for Fort Baker, opposed the retreat and conference center component, and expressed concerns related to traffic and potential effects upon the character of the site and its resources. One representative of the Tomales Bay Association supported development of a youth hostel (included in the GMP Alternative).

In addition, ten letters and 15 e-mail messages expressed opinions regarding the Fort Baker Plan. Four of the letters were in general support of the public planning process and/or the Proposed Action. The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission acknowledged consistency with the San Francisco Bay Plan. The City of Sausalito expressed concerns for potential impacts of the proposed plan and various compliance issues. The local sanitary district concurred with the EIS analysis and conclusions regarding wastewater capacity but requested that the existing agreement for these services at Fort Baker (and NPS future rights to such services) be

revisited. The e-mail messages primarily expressed opposition to the conference and retreat center component, mostly based upon size. One message expressed concern related to bicycle safety. Post card mailings in support and in opposition to the plan were also received during the 30-day no action period.

After the 30-day no action period concluded several letters, as well as postcards and e-mail messages similar to those described above were received. All submittals received during the entire conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process are addressed in the Record of Decision.

### Basis for Decision

The environmentally preferred alternative was the Proposed Action. The maximum potential environmental impacts of new uses and site improvements, as analyzed in the in EIS, were limited based upon build-out of a 350-room retreat and conference center. However, in the Record of Decision the NPS commits to soliciting the smallest possible, economically feasible retreat and conference center proposal that fulfills objectives of the Fort Baker Plan.

During the conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process, the NPS, working with the public, established goals and objectives that were used as a framework for evaluating potential new uses and site improvements at Fort Baker. These were developed based on NPS policy, the 1980 GMP, public input, current knowledge about the site, and an understanding of Fort Baker's national park qualities. The Purpose and Need (§ 1.3 of the EIS) addressed the following goals: (i) Promote the National Park mission; (ii) Achieve sustainability; (iii) Retain and relate to the site's special qualities; (iv) Promote public access; (v) Minimize environmental impacts; (vi) Retain and complement permanent site tenants and other GGNRA sites and programs.

The basis for the decision to select the "Proposed Action" is its ability to most successfully maximize all the goals and objectives disclosed at the beginning of the conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process. The Selected Action provides the most desirable combination of promoting the National Park mission and public use, while preserving the site's resources and minimizing environmental effects including traffic.

### Measures To Minimize Harm

Numerous practical mitigation measures to minimize or avoid potential adverse effects of the Selected Action are identified. As a result of public collaboration in developing the Fort Baker Plan, new measures were developed and safeguards initially noted in the Draft EIS were refined to be more stringent in the Final EIS. One of the new stipulations relates to the size of the proposed retreat and conference center—in response to public concern about the 350 room maximum size evaluated, the NPS is now committed to working with the public in soliciting the smallest possible, economically viable retreat and conference center proposal that fulfills Plan objectives. Additional mitigations recommended by the public or other agencies, or developed by the NPS in response to issues of local concern, were added in the Final EIS. In total, more than 70 mitigation measures have been included.

Moreover, the NPS is committed to seeking and implementing innovative approaches to reduce long-term dependence on automobile use at Fort Baker, to working cooperatively with other agencies to seek regional solutions to transportation challenges in the areas surrounding Fort Baker, and to engaging in studies to reduce or eliminate parking and uncontrolled automobile traffic within Fort Baker. The NPS is specifically committed to working with the City of Sausalito, the Marin County Congestion Management Agency, the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, Caltrans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

### Copy of Complete Decision Available

The synopsis provided above addresses only some of the considerations made in selecting, as the final Fort Baker Plan, the alternative identified as the "Proposed Action" in the Draft and Final EIS. Effecting the Fort Baker Plan will not impair park resources or values. Indeed, acting upon this Plan will significantly enhance the site's natural and cultural resources. A copy of the Record of Decision may be requested from the Superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Building 201, Ft. Mason, San Francisco, CA 94123 (or may be obtained via [www.nps.gov/goga](http://www.nps.gov/goga)). The Superintendent is responsible for plan implementation.

Dated: June 15, 2000.

**James R. Shevock,**

*Acting Regional Director, Pacific West Region.*

[FR Doc. 00-15730 Filed 6-21-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-70-P**

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation 332-414]

#### Agency Form Submitted for OMB Review

**AGENCY:** United States International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** In accordance with the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Commission has submitted a request for review and clearance of a questionnaire to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The Commission has requested OMB approval of this submission by July 5, 2000.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 16, 2000.

#### PURPOSE OF INFORMATION COLLECTION:

The questionnaire is for use by the Commission in connection with investigation No. 332-414, Competitive Assessment of the U.S. Large Civil Aircraft Aerostructures Industry, instituted under the authority of section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332(g)). This investigation was requested by the House Committee on Ways and Means (the Committee). The Commission expects to deliver the results of its investigation to the Committee by June 13, 2001.

#### SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL:

- (1) *Number of forms submitted:* 1.
- (2) *Title of form:* U.S. Producers Questionnaire—Competitive Assessment of the U.S. Large Civil Aircraft Aerostructures Industry.
- (3) *Type of request:* new.
- (4) *Frequency of use:* single data gathering (scheduled for 2000).
- (5) *Description of respondents:* U.S. firms that produce aerostructures.
- (6) *Estimated number of respondents:* 12.
- (7) *Estimated total number of hours to complete the forms:* 240.
- (8) Information obtained from the form that qualifies as confidential business information will be so treated by the Commission and not disclosed in a manner that would reveal the individual operations of a firm.

#### Additional Information or Comment

Copies of the form and supporting documents may be obtained from Peder Andersen (USITC, telephone no. (202) 205-3388). Comments about the proposal should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Room 10102 (Docket Library), Washington, DC 20503, ATTENTION: Docket Librarian. All comments should be specific, indicating which part of the

questionnaire is objectionable, describing the concern in detail, and including specific suggested revisions or language changes. Copies of any comments should be provided to Robert Rogowsky, Director, Office of Operations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, who is the Commission's designated Senior Official under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting our TDD terminal (telephone no. 202-205-1810). General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

Issued: June 16, 2000.

By order of the Commission.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 00-15692 Filed 6-21-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. TA-201-72]

#### Extruded Rubber Thread

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Institution and scheduling of an investigation under section 202 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252) (the Act).

**SUMMARY:** Following receipt of a petition properly filed on June 5, 2000, on behalf of North American Rubber Thread, Fall River, MA, the Commission instituted investigation No. TA-201-72 under section 202 of the Act to determine whether extruded rubber thread is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to be a substantial cause of serious injury, or the threat thereof, to the domestic industry producing an article like or directly competitive with the imported article.<sup>1</sup>

For further information concerning the conduct of this investigation, hearing procedures, and rules of general

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this investigation, extruded rubber thread is defined as vulcanized rubber thread, obtained by extrusion of stable or concentrated natural rubber latex of any cross sectional shape, measuring from 0.18 mm (which is 0.007 inch or 140 gauge) to 1.42 mm (which is 0.056 inch or 18 gauge) in diameter. Such extruded rubber thread is classified in heading 4007.00.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS). Although the HTS category is provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.