

Comment #4: Some parks were established because of their natural qualities, some because of their historic qualities, and some because of their recreational qualities. Since these parks and their resources are not all the same, the policies should not treat them as if they are all the same. (Conversely, another commenter felt that a stronger statement should be included to remind readers that all parks deserve the same level of protection, regardless of what they are called.)

Our response: The Organic Act states the "fundamental purpose" of all national parks, national monuments, and reservations managed by NPS. A 1978 amendment to the NPS General Authorities Act "further reaffirms, declares, and directs that the promotion and regulation of the various units of the National Park System. * * * shall be consistent with and founded in the purpose established by" the Organic Act, and that, "The authorization of activities shall be construed and the protection, management, and administration of these areas shall be conducted in light of the high public value and integrity of the National Park System and shall not be exercised in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established, except as may have been or shall be directly and specifically provided by Congress." These statutory provisions make it clear that the mandates of the Organic Act and the General Authorities Act apply equally to all units of the National Park System, except as Congress may have directly and specifically provided otherwise.

Comment #5: Federal courts have consistently reaffirmed the policies interpretation that, when there is a conflict between conserving resources and values and providing for public enjoyment, conservation is to be predominant.

Our response: This point has been added to the policy text.

Comment #6: The proposed policy presumes that the first line of defense against impairment should be to limit public enjoyment. The NPS should instead examine other remedies before placing unnecessary restrictions on public enjoyment.

Our response: This interpretation of these laws makes it clear that NPS may not allow the impairment of park resources and values, but it does not establish any presumptions or preferences as to what management steps must be taken to avoid those impairments. However, other parts of "Management Policies," particularly Chapter 8: Use of the Parks, include NPS policies that are relevant.

Comment #7: Impairments caused by actions that were reviewed and approved as acceptable in the past should be exempt from eliminating the impairment.

Our response: The Organic Act and the General Authorities Act do not include any provisions to exempt prior authorized activities from the prohibition on the impairment of park resources and values.

Comment #8: The policy should be clear that as-yet undiscovered resources must be protected from impairment, in the same way that known resources must be protected.

Our response: We agree that the resources and values which the Organic Act protects are not limited to those that we happen to know about today. We believe the policy is sufficiently clear on this point.

Comment #9: The new policy requirement for an "impairment review" by the NPS will be costly, contentious, and burdensome.

Our response: For the past 30 years the NPS has been complying with the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act that we evaluate the environmental consequences of our proposed actions. We plan to integrate into the NEPA compliance process the new requirement for a determination that there would be no impairment of park resources and values from a proposed activity. We do not expect it to make the management decision-making process appreciably more costly, contentious, or burdensome.

Comment #10: The policies set forth in section 1.4 need to be supplemented by additional directives and procedures to help ensure their effective implementation.

Our response: We will judge over the coming months whether field managers have difficulty applying the policy, and we will issue supplemental guidance, as necessary.

Dated: September 8, 2000.

Loran Fraser,

Chief, Office of Policy.

[FR Doc. 00-23732 Filed 9-14-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation 332-413]

The Economic Impact of U.S. Sanctions With Respect to Cuba

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Additional day for public hearing.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 11, 2000.

SUMMARY: The public hearing on this matter is scheduled for September 19, 2000. A second day, September 20, 2000, has been added for this public hearing. The public hearing will be held at the U.S. International Trade Commission building, 500 E Street SW Washington, DC, beginning at 9:30 a.m. on both September 19, and September 20, 2000. Notice of institution of this investigation was published in the **Federal Register** of April 24, 2000 (65 FR 21788).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Information may be obtained from Mr. James Stamps (202-205-3227), Office of Economics, or Mr. Jonathan Coleman (202-205-3465), Office of Industries, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, 20436. For information on the legal aspects of this investigation, contact William Gearhart of the Office of the General Counsel (202-205-3091). Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

List of Subjects

Cuba, sanctions, exports, imports.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 11, 2000.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-23733 Filed 9-14-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment Standards Administration, Wage and Hour Division

Minimum Wages for Federal and Federally Assisted Construction; General Wage Determination Decisions

General wage determination decisions of the Secretary of Labor are issued in accordance with applicable law and are based on the information obtained by the Department of Labor from its study of local wage conditions and data made available from other sources. They specify the basic hourly wage rates and