

Notice of the approved Record of Decision will also be published in the **Federal Register**. As this is a delegated EIS, the official responsible for the final decision is the Regional Director, Pacific West Region; subsequently the official responsible for implementing the approved fire management plan would be the Superintendent, Whiskeytown National Recreation Area.

Dated: May 7, 2004.

Jonathan B. Jarvis,

Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

[FR Doc. 04-13519 Filed 6-15-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-52-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Availability of a Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan, Arkansas Post National Memorial, Arkansas

SUMMARY: On April 2, the Director, Midwest Region approved the Record of Decision for the project. As soon as practical, the National Park Service (NPS) will begin to implement the general management plan described as the preferred alternative (alternative B) contained in the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) issued on January 6. In the preferred alternative, the visitor center would be rehabilitated and expanded to better highlight the park's cultural and natural resources. The park staff would develop activities such as festivals and programs that focus on cultures that are associated with Arkansas Post National Memorial (ARPO). Interpretation of the resources associated with the Civil War battle would be enhanced to provide for greater visitor appreciation and understanding. The picnic area would be retained and an informal overflow parking area would be developed to accommodate these special events. Present road systems would be retained.

At the Osotouy Unit, an access road and a small visitor contact station and a parking area would be developed in an area that is now an agricultural field. This area would include a staging area for group tours. Housing for a park ranger and an adjacent small maintenance area would be developed near by. A small research support facility would also be constructed on site and would provide the necessary support for scientific study at Osotouy. An interpretive loop trail focusing on American Indian Culture, Euro-American arrival and the interaction between the two cultures would be

developed for the visitor contact station to the mounds with a portion along Lake Dumond.

This alternative was deemed to be the environmentally preferred alternative, and it was determined that implementation of the selected actions will not constitute an impairment of park resources and values. This course of action and three alternatives were analyzed in the draft and FEIS. The full range of foreseeable environmental consequences was assessed, and appropriate mitigating measures identified.

The full record of decision includes a statement of the decision made, synopses of other alternatives considered, the basis for the decision, a description of the environmentally preferable alternative, a finding on impairment of park resources and values, and a listing of measures to minimize environmental harm.

Basis for Decision

In reaching its decision to select the preferred alternative, the NPS considered the purposes for which Arkansas Post National Memorial was established, and other laws and policies that apply to lands in the memorial, including the Organic Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and the NPS Management Policies. The NPS, also, carefully considered public comments received during the planning process.

To develop a preliminary preferred alternative, the planning team evaluated the four draft alternatives that had been reviewed by the public. To minimize the influence of individual biases and opinions, the team used an objective analysis process called "Choosing by Advantages." This process has been used extensively by government agencies and the private sector. Decision points identify the key choices that still remain to be made after all the mandates are taken into account and the park's purpose and significance are considered. For this general management plan, three "decision points" were identified:

1. What level of development can be allowed while still preserving the park's cultural and natural resources unimpaired for future generation?
2. What visitor use, including local recreational use, can be accommodated while preserving the integrity of the park's cultural and natural resources?
3. How does the park best memorialize the legislated historical period while preserving park resources?

These decision points were covered by looking at the varying degrees of these decision points: Alternative C emphasizes the preservation of cultural

and natural resources of the park for future generations. In this alternative there are limited recreational areas and trails are kept to a minimum, offering very little interpretation or orientation for the park visitor. In this alternative, recreational use is minimized.

Alternative D focuses on decision points 2 and 3. In this alternative, trails would be expanded and the park lake would be opened up for recreation. This alternative would seek to develop new ways for the public to gain an appreciation and understanding of the park's natural and cultural resources. Educational and interpretive goals would be emphasized through an array of recreational activities and visitor interpretation would emphasize the parks historical significance. This alternative, however, opens additional areas to recreation and interpretation and does not focus enough on the preservation of the park's cultural and natural resources for future generations.

The preferred alternative, alternative B, best answers all three of these decision points by striking a balance between recreational use, cultural and natural resource preservation and memorizing the legislated historical period. By emphasizing interpretation of the area's 300 years of cultural cooperation, conflict, synthesis, and diversity, alternative B encompasses both recreational use and conservation of cultural and natural resources. A no-action alternative, alternative A was included for comparison.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent Edward Wood, Jr., Arkansas Post National Memorial, 1741 Old Post Road, Gillett, AR 72055; telephone 870-548-2207, or <http://planning.nps.gov/plans.cfm>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A limited number of individual copies of the Record of Decision may be obtained from the Superintendent listed above.

Dated: April 21, 2004.

David N. Given,

Acting Regional Director, Midwest Region.

[FR Doc. 04-13517 Filed 6-15-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-BW-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

[DES 04-33]

Water Transfer Program for the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, 2005 to 2014

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the draft environmental impact statement/ environmental impact report (Draft EIS/EIR) and notice of public hearing.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority (Exchange Contractors) have made available for public review and comment the Draft EIS/EIR for a 10-year water transfer program. The program would consist of the transfer of up to 130,000 acre-feet of substitute water (a maximum of 80,000 acre-feet of developed water from conservation measures, including tailwater recovery, and groundwater pumping and a maximum of 50,000 acre-feet from temporary land fallowing) from the Exchange Contractors to other Central Valley Project (CVP) contractors, to Reclamation for delivery to the San Joaquin Valley wetland habitat areas (wildlife refuges), and to Reclamation and/or DWR for use by the CALFED Environmental Water Account (EWA) as replacement water for CVP contractors. Reclamation would approve and/or execute short-term and/or long-term temporary water transfers or agreements.

DATES: A public hearing will be held to receive oral or written comments regarding the project's environmental effects on July 7, 2004 from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. in Los Banos, California.

Submit written comments on the Draft EIS/EIR on or before August 2, 2004 at the address provided below.

ADDRESSES: The public hearing will be held at the Miller & Lux Building, 830 Sixth Street, Los Banos, CA 93635.

Written comments should be sent to Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, Division of Environmental Affairs, Attention: Mr. Bob Eckart, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, California 95825, Fax: (916) 978-5055.

Copies of the Draft EIS/EIR may be requested from Mr. Eckart at the above address or by calling (916) 978-5051. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for locations where copies of the Draft EIS/EIR are available for public inspection.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Bob Eckart at the above address, by calling (916) 978-5051, or by e-mail: reckart@mp.usbr.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose/objective of the proposed 10-year transfer program is the transfer of water from the Exchange Contractors to:

- South of Delta CVP contractors to meet demands of agriculture, municipal, and industrial uses,

- The Department of the Interior's Water Acquisition Program for delivery to the San Joaquin Valley Federal, State, and private wildlife refuges to meet Incremental Level 4 needs, and/or

- Reclamation and/or DWR for use by the CALFED EWA Program to benefit CVP operations by providing replacement water to CVP contractors.

The Exchange Contractors' proposed water transfer program would assist Reclamation in maximizing the use of limited existing water resources for agriculture, fish and wildlife resources, and municipal and industrial purposes. Water would be transferred to other CVP contractors to support the production of agricultural crops and livestock within the limits of their current agreements. CVP contractors include Santa Clara Valley Water District which is in need of short-term water supplies to support agriculture, municipal, and industrial uses in Santa Clara County.

Reclamation's Water Acquisition Program needs additional water to provide the refuges with the increment between Level 2 and Level 4 water quantities for fish and wildlife habitat development. Reclamation and/or DWR may also need to acquire additional CVP water south of the Delta to replace water used for fish protection actions pursuant to CALFED's EWA Program (for the benefit of the CVP).

The water transfers would occur largely within the San Joaquin Valley of Central California. The Exchange Contractors service area covers parts of Fresno, Madera, Merced, and Stanislaus counties. The agricultural water users that would benefit from the potential transfers are located in the counties of Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Merced, Madera, Fresno, San Benito, Santa Clara, Tulare, Kings, and Kern. The wetland habitat areas that may receive the water are located in Merced, Fresno, Tulare, and Kern counties. Water purchased for use by Reclamation and/or DWR for the EWA may be provided to CVP contractors in the West San Joaquin and San Felipe divisions to replace water bypassed at Tracy Pumping Plant pursuant to EWA fish protection actions.

The Draft EIS/EIR addresses impacts associated with water development by the Exchange Contractors and related effects associated with water use by CVP contractors and the wildlife refuges. Resources evaluated for potential direct and indirect effects from the proposed transfer program include: surface water, groundwater, biological (vegetation, wildlife, and fisheries), air quality, land

use (including agriculture), socioeconomics, Indian Trust Assets, and environmental justice. An evaluation of cumulative hydrologic and water service area impacts associated with reasonably foreseeable actions is included also.

Copies of the Draft EIS/EIR are available for public inspection and review at the following locations:

- Bureau of Reclamation, Office of Public Affairs, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825-1898; telephone: (916) 978-5100
- San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, 541 H Street, Los Banos, CA 93635; telephone: (209) 827-8616
- California State Library, 914 Capitol Mall, Suite E-29, Sacramento
- Resources Agency Library, 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 117, Sacramento
- San Francisco Public Library, McAllister and Larkin, San Francisco
- Fresno County Public Library, 2420 Mariposa Street, Fresno
- Merced County Public Library, 1312 South 7th Street, Los Banos
- Santa Clara County Public Library, 10441 Bandle Drive, Cupertino
- Kern County Library, 701 Truxton Avenue, Bakersfield
- UCD Shields Library, Documents Department, University of California, Davis
- UCB Water Resources Center Archives, 410 O'Brien Hall, Berkeley

Oral and written comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, will be made available for public review. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their home address from public disclosure, which will be honored to the extent allowable by law. There may be circumstances in which a respondent's identity may also be withheld from public disclosure, as allowable by law. If you wish to have your name and/or address withheld, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public disclosure in their entirety.

Hearing Process Information:

The purpose of the public hearing is to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on environmental issues addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR. Written comments will also be accepted.

Dated: April 15, 2004.

Susan L. Ramos,

Assistant Regional Director, Mid-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 04-13546 Filed 6-15-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-101 (Second Review)]

Greige Polyester Cotton Printcloth From China

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Commission determination to conduct a full five-year review concerning the antidumping duty order on greige polyester cotton printcloth from China.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it will proceed with a full review pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order on greige polyester cotton printcloth from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. A schedule for the review will be established and announced at a later date. For further information concerning the conduct of this review and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 4, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mary Messer (202) 205-3193, Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's 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>). The public record for this review may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 4, 2004, the Commission determined that it should proceed to a full review in the

subject five-year review pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Act.¹ The Commission found that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (69 FR 9640, March 1, 2004) was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission also found that other circumstances warranted conducting a full review. A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's web site.

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 10, 2004.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04-13550 Filed 6-15-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 332-415]

U.S. Trade and Investment With Sub-Saharan Africa

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice of preparation of fifth report and opportunity to submit information and comments.

SUMMARY: Following receipt on March 12, 2000, of a letter from the United States Trade Representative (USTR), the Commission instituted investigation No. 332-415, U.S. Trade and Investment with Sub-Saharan Africa, under section 1332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332(g)) for the purpose of preparing a series of five annual reports. This is the fifth and final report in the series, and the Commission plans to transmit this fifth report to the USTR by December 10, 2004.

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 9, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Nannette Christ, Office of Economics (202-205-3263), or William Gearhart, Office of the General Counsel (202-205-3091) for information on legal aspects of the investigation. The media should contact Margaret O'Laughlin, Office of External Relations (202-205-1819). Hearing impaired individuals are

¹ Commissioner Miller is not participating in this second five-year review.

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 202-205-2000. General information about the Commission may be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

Background: The USTR requested that the Commission prepare a series of annual reports for five years containing the following information:

1. For the last five years (and the latest quarter available), data on U.S. merchandise trade and services trade with sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), including statistics by country, by major sectors, and by the top 25 commodities.
2. A summary of U.S. and total foreign direct investment and portfolio investment in sub-Saharan Africa.
3. Statistical information on U.S. imports from sub-Saharan Africa under the AGOA and GSP programs, by country and by major product categories/commodities, and information on AGOA-related investment.

4. Updates on regional integration organizations in sub-Saharan Africa including statistics on U.S. trade with major regional groupings (ECOWAS, WAEMU, COMESA, SADC, SACU, EAC, IGAD, IOC, and CEMAC) and, where applicable, information on each group's tariff structure.

5. A description of major U.S. trade capacity-building initiatives related to SSA, a summary of multilateral and U.S. bilateral assistance to the countries of sub-Saharan Africa, and, where applicable, a description of major non-U.S. trade preference programs for countries in SSA.

6. Sector profiles for sub-Saharan Africa, including information on trade, investment, industry and policy developments, by major sector. The six sector profiles in this investigation include: agricultural, fisheries and forest products; chemicals; petroleum and energy-related products; minerals and metals; textiles and apparel; and certain transportation equipment.

7. Country-by-country profiles on each of the 48 countries in sub-Saharan Africa, including information on major trading partners, by country. Summary of the economic, trade, and investment climates in each of the countries of sub-Saharan Africa, including a description of the basic tariff structure (e.g., the average tariff rate and the average