

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS ON IMPORTANT RESOURCE CONCERNS—Continued

Effects	Alternative No. 1 No action	Alternative No. 2 Channel improvement (NED)
Adverse Annual .....	\$0 .....	\$78,000.
Net Beneficial .....	\$0 .....	\$16,226.
Environmental Quality Account		
Threatened and Endangered Species .....	No impact .....	No impact.
Streams, Lakes, and Wetlands .....	No impact .....	No impact.
Prime Farmland .....	No impact .....	Reduce flooding on 1209 acres.
Fish and Wildlife Habitats .....	Adversely impacted .....	No impact.
Water Quality .....	Increase in stream turbidity .....	Short term decrease in water quality during construction and improvement of water quality long term.
Sedimentation .....	No impact .....	No significant long term impact.
Other Social Effects		
Average Annual Flood damages .....	Increase in average annual acres flooded above existing 1990 acres and in flood damages to infrastructure and residences.	Flood protection to agricultural lands by reducing average annual area flooded by 1,385 acres, reduce flood damages to infrastructure and residences.
Cultural and Historic Resources .....	No impact .....	No impact.
Land Use and Floodplain Management .....	Land use might change as increased flooding decreases land productivity.	No change to land use and improvement to land management decisions.
Transportation and Access .....	Increased flooding of five roads and one bridge located downstream.	Transportation access would be maintained and improved.
Regional Economic Development Account (Positive Effects/Negative Effects Annualized)		
Region .....	\$0/\$0 .....	\$0/\$27,300.
Nation .....	\$0/\$0 .....	\$94,226/\$50,700.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of the improvement to Segment No. 7 of the Main Ditch is to provide flood prevention benefits to the agricultural lands, infrastructure, and residential area along Segment No. 7. The Environmental Assessment summarized above indicates that this Federal action will not cause significant local, regional, or national impacts on the environment. I find that neither the proposed action nor any of the alternatives is a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Therefore, based on above findings, I have determined that an Environmental Impact Statement for Segment No. 7 of the Main Ditch, Poinsett Watershed is not required.

Dated: October 15, 2004.

**Kalven L. Trice,**

*State Conservationist.*

[FR Doc. 04-24546 Filed 11-3-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-16-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

**Rural Utilities Service**

**Information Collection Activity;  
Comment Request**

**AGENCY:** Rural Utilities Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended), the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) invites comments on this information collection for which RUS intends to request approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

**DATES:** Comments on this notice must be received by January 3, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Richard C. Annan, Acting Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, 1400 Independence Ave., SW., STOP 1522, Room 5174 South Building, Washington, DC 20250-1522. Telephone: (202) 720-0784, FAX: (202) 720-4120.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) regulation (5 CFR part 1320) implementing provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13) requires that interested members of the public and affected agencies have an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping activities (see 5 CFR 1320.8(d)). This notice identifies an information collection that RUS is submitting to OMB for extension.

Comments are invited on: (a) 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; (b) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments may be sent to: Richard C. Annan, Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, STOP 1522, Room 5068, 1400 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20250-1522. FAX: (202) 720-4120.

*Title:* Public Television Station Digital Transition Grant Program.

*OMB Control Number:* 0572-0134.

*Type of Request:* Extension of a currently approved information collection.

*Abstract:* As part of the nation's evolution to digital television, the Federal Communications Commission had ordered all television broadcasters

to initiate the broadcast of a digital television signal. Public television stations rely largely on community financial support to operate. In many rural areas the cost of the transition to digital broadcasting may exceed community resources. Since rural communities depend on public television stations for services ranging from educational course content in their schools to local news, weather, and agricultural reports, any disruption of public television broadcasting would be detrimental.

Initiating a digital broadcast requires the installation of a new antenna, transmitter or translator, and new digital program management facilities consisting of processing and storage systems. Public television stations use a combination of transmitters and translators to serve the rural public. If the public television station is to perform program origination functions, as most do, digital cameras, editing and mastering systems are required. A new studio-to-tower site communications link may be required to transport the digital broadcast signal to each transmitter and translator. The capability to broadcast some programming in a high definition television format is inherent in the digital television standard, and this can require additional facilities at the studio. These are the new components of the digital transition.

In designing the national competition for the distribution of these grant funds, priority is given to public television stations serving the areas that would be most unable to fund the digital transition without a grant. The largest sources of funding for public television stations are public membership and business contributions. In rural areas, lower population density reduces the field of membership, and rural areas have fewer businesses per capita than urban and suburban areas. Therefore, rurality is a primary predictor of the need for grant funding for a public television station's digital transition. In addition, some rural areas have per capita income levels that are lower than the national average, and public television stations covering these areas in particular are likely to have difficulty funding the digital transition. As a result, the consideration of the per capita income of a public television station's coverage area is a secondary predictor of the need for grant funding. Finally, some public television stations may face special difficulty accomplishing the transition, and a third scoring factor for station hardship will account for conditions that make these public television stations less

likely to accomplish the digital transition without a grant.

*Estimate of Burden:* Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 21 hours per response.

*Respondents:* Not-for-profit institutions; State, Local or Tribal Government.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 50.

*Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent:* 1.12.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 1,168 hours.

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from MaryPat Daskal, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, at (202) 720-7853. FAX: (202) 720-4120

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: October 29, 2004.

**Curtis M. Anderson,**

*Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service.*

[FR Doc. 04-24604 Filed 11-3-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-15-P**

## CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**TIME AND DATE:** Tuesday, November 16, 2004, at 7 p.m. local time.

**PLACE:** North West Georgia Trade and Convention Center, Lecture Hall Theater, 2211 Dug Gap Battle Road, Dalton, Georgia, (Telephone No. 1-800-824-7469).

**STATUS:** Open to the public.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:** The Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (CSB) is convening a community meeting in connection with its investigation of a toxic gas release that occurred on April 12, 2004, at the MFG Chemical Inc. facility located in Dalton, Georgia.

At the meeting CSB staff will present their preliminary investigative findings to the Board, including a summary of the incident. There will also be a panel discussion consisting of five emergency response organizations. After the staff presentations the Board will allow time for public comment.

All staff presentations are preliminary and are intended solely to allow the Board to consider in a public forum the issues and factors involved in the incident. Factual analyses, conclusions, or findings contained in the staff presentations should not be considered final.

This meeting will be open to the public. Please notify CSB if a translator or interpreter is needed, at least five (5) business days prior to the meeting.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:** Daniel Horowitz, (202) 261-7600.

Dated: November 1, 2004.

**Christopher W. Warner,**

*General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 04-24701 Filed 11-2-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6350-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 49-2004]

#### Foreign-Trade Zone 15—Kansas City, MO, Application for Subzone, Pfizer, Inc. (Pharmaceutical Products)

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board), by the Greater Kansas City Foreign Trade Zone, Inc., grantee of FTZ 15, requesting special-purpose subzone status for the manufacturing facilities of Pfizer, Inc. (Pfizer), in the Lee's Summit, Missouri, area, within the Kansas City Missouri Customs port of entry. The application was submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR part 400). It was formally filed on October 29, 2004.

Pfizer's plant (104 acres) is located at One Pfizer Way, Lee's Summit, Jackson County, Missouri. The facility (approximately 235 employees) is used for the manufacture, processing, warehousing and distribution of pharmaceuticals, as well as for research and development activities. Pfizer will use zone procedures at the Lee's Summit plant to manufacture Revolution (TM), (HTSUS 3004.90.9103), a topical parasiticide for dogs and cats. The activity related to the manufacture of Revolution (TM) involves the use of the foreign-sourced chemicals butylated hydroxytoluene (HTSUS 2907.19.8000), hydroxylamine (HTSUS 2928.00.5000), and selamectin (HTSUS 2932.29.5050), two of which are processed at Pfizer's Groton, Connecticut facility, prior to shipment to the Lee's Summit facility. A subzone application is currently pending with the FTZ Board for Pfizer's Groton facility (Docket 45-2004). Foreign-sourced chemicals will account for most of the material value of the finished product.

Zone procedures used at Lee's Summit would exempt Pfizer from Customs duty payments on foreign