Recreation Area Management Plan. There would be no new convenience store or new shop building.

Responsible Official: The Ashley National Forest Supervisor, George Weldon is the responsible official. The address is Ashley National Forest, 355 N. Vernal Ave., Vernal, UT 84078.

Nature of Decision To Be Made: The decision to be made is whether to allow the upgrade of the Cedar Springs Marina, and whether to re-issue the Special Use Permit for 25 years, and also whether to increase the footprint (acreage) of the Special Use Permit as is proposed or to allow partial upgrade of the marina as in Alternative 3 or to not allow the upgrade as is found in the No Action Alternative.

Scoping Process: A scoping letter will be sent to interested parties. The letter will discuss the proposed project and purpose and need along with issues related to the project.

Preliminary Issues: The following are preliminary issues from early analysis. Fluctuating water levels have reduced public service at the marina, there is extreme parking congestion, antiquated facilities limit the proponents ability to provide valuable services to the public, compliance with the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area Management Plan, and the strong public demand for marina services.

Permits or Licenses Required: Army Corp of Engineers 404 permit

Comment Requested: This notice of intent initiates the scoping process which guides the development of the environmental impact statement.

Early Notice of Importance of Public Participation in Subsequent Environmental Review: A draft environmental impact statement will be prepared for comment. The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* v. *NRCD,* 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental impact statement state but that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon* v. *Hodel,* 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc.* v. *Harris,* 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45 day comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Comments received, including the names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposal and will be available for public inspection.

(Authority: 40 CFR 1501.7 and 1508.22; Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, Section 21)

Dated: August 11, 2004.

Eileen Richmond,

Acting Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 04–19058 Filed 8–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

Procurement List; Additions

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

ACTION: Additions to Procurement List.

SUMMARY: This action adds to the Procurement List a product and services to be furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 19, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, Jefferson Plaza 2, Suite 10800, 1421 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202–3259.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sheryl D. Kennerly, (703) 603–7740.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 14, June 18, and June 25, 2004, the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled published notice (69 FR 32975, 34121, and 35580) of proposed additions to the Procurement List.

After consideration of the material presented to it concerning capability of qualified nonprofit agencies to provide the product and services and impact of the additions on the current or most recent contractors, the Committee has determined that the product and services listed below are suitable for procurement by the Federal Government under 41 U.S.C. 46–48c and 41 CFR 51–2.4.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance requirements for small entities other than the small organizations that will furnish the product and services to the Government.

2. The action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the product and services to the Government.

3. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c) in connection with the product and services proposed for addition to the Procurement List.

End of Certification

Accordingly, the following product and services are added to the Procurement List:

Product

Product/NSN: Side Rack, Vehicle Body, 2510–00–590–9734.

NPA: Tuscola County Community Mental Health Services, Caro, Michigan.

Contract Activity: U.S. Army Tank Acquisition Center, Warren, Michigan.

Services

Service Type/Location: Custodial Services, Grissom Air Reserve Base, 448 Mustang Avenue, Grissom ARB, Indiana.

NPA: Wabash Center, Inc., Lafayette, Indiana.

Contract Activity: Air Force Reserve Command, Grissom ARB, Indiana.

Service Type/Location: Food Service Attendant, Minnesota Air National Guard, St. Paul, Minnesota.

NPA: AccessAbility, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Contract Activity: Air National Guard-St. Paul, MN, St. Paul, Minnesota.

This action does not affect current contracts awarded prior to the effective date of this addition or options that may be exercised under those contracts.

Sheryl D. Kennerly,

Director, Information Management.

[FR Doc. 04–19154 Filed 8–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 26–2004]

Tumi, Inc.—Application for Subzone Status; Amendment of Application and Reopening of Comment Period

The application for subzone status at the Tumi, Inc. facility in Vidalia, Georgia, submitted by the Savannah Airport Commission (69 FR 34993, 6/23/04), has been amended. The company has amended the application to include kitting operations. The company plans to assemble computer accessory kits, electric adapter kits and modem/electric kits (HTS 8471.60 and 8504.40, duty-free). Imported components that could be included in a kit include: a leather pouch, a computer mouse, receiver, cable, LED light, a power travel adapter and a travel modem (HTS 4202.91, 8471.60, 8471.80, 8504.40, 8544.41 and 9405.40, duty rate ranges from duty-free to 4.5%). The company has also indicated that it will import nylon pouches (HTS 4202.92, duty rate 17.6%), but that they will be admitted to the zone in privileged foreign status.

The comment period for the case referenced above is being reopened until September 20, 2004, to allow interested parties additional time in which to comment. Rebuttal comments may be submitted during the subsequent 15 day period, until October 4, 2004. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at one of the following addresses:

1. Submissions Via Express/Package Delivery Services: Foreign-Trade-Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Franklin Court Building—Suite 4100W, 1099 14th St. NW., Washington, DC 20005; or

2. Submissions Via the U.S. Postal Service: Foreign-Trade-Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, FCB—Suite 4100W, 1401 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: August 12, 2004.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–19138 Filed 8–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–813]

Certain Preserved Mushrooms From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On March 8, 2004, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the fourth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India. The review covers five manufacturers/exporters. The period of review is February 1, 2002, through January 31, 2003.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled ''Final Results of Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 20, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David J. Goldberger or Katherine Johnson, AD/CVD Office 2, Import Administration-Room B099, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4136 or (202) 482–4929, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The review covers five manufacturers/exporters: Agro Dutch Industries Ltd. (''Agro Dutch''), Dinesh Agro Products, Ltd. (''Dinesh Agro''), Premier Mushroom Farms (''Premier''), Saptarishi Agro Industries, Ltd. (''Saptarishi Agro''), and Weikfield Agro Products Ltd. (''Weikfield''). The period of review is February 1, 2002, through January 31, 2003.

On March 8, 2004, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published the preliminary results of the fourth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India (69 FR 10659) (''Preliminary Results''). We invited parties to comment on the preliminary results of review. On March 22, 2004, we received a request for a public hearing from the petitioner.[1]

On May 5, 2004, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the postponement of the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India (69 FR 25063). We conducted a verification of Agro Dutch's sales data from May 18 through May 21, 2004. At our request, Agro Dutch submitted revised sales data bases on June 2, 2004, which incorporated revisions resulting from the verification.

We received case briefs from Weikfield on June 7, 2004, (brief dated June 2, 2004), and the petitioner, Agro Dutch, and Premier on June 10, 2004. The petitioner and Agro Dutch filed rebuttal briefs on June 17, 2004. Agro Dutch withdrew its rebuttal brief on June 22, 2004, and submitted a replacement brief on June 24, 2004.[2] On June 28, 2004, the petitioner withdrew its request for a public hearing. We have conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act'').

Scope of the Order

The products covered by the order are certain preserved mushrooms, whether imported whole, sliced, diced, or as stems and pieces. The preserved mushrooms covered under the order are the species *Agaricus bisporus* and *Agaricus bitorquis.* ''Preserved mushrooms'' refer to mushrooms that have been prepared or preserved by cleaning, blanching, and sometimes slicing or cutting. These mushrooms are then packed and heated in containers including but not limited to cans or glass jars in a suitable liquid medium, including but not limited to water,

[1] The petitioner is the Coalition for Fair Preserved Mushroom Trade which includes the American Mushroom Institute and the following domestic companies: L.K. Bowman, Inc.; Modern Mushroom Farms, Inc.; Monterey Mushrooms, Inc.; Mount Laurel Canning Corp.; Mushrooms Canning Company; Southwood Farms; Sunny Dell Foods, Inc.; and United Canning Corp.

[2] The circumstances regarding the withdrawal and replacement of the Agro Dutch rebuttal brief are discussed in a June 28, 2004, memorandum to the file.