

Environmental Impact Statement (GMP/EIS) for the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, Westmoreland County, Virginia. The park contains 550 acres that comprise significant portions of the 17th and 18th century Washington family plantation holdings, including the site of the home where George Washington was born and spent his early years. Prepared by planners in the NPS Northeast Region, with assistance from advisors and consultants, the GMP/EIS will propose a long-term approach to managing the George Washington Birthplace National Monument.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Superintendent, George Washington Birthplace National Monument, (804) 224-1732

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Consistent with the site's mission, NPS policy, and other laws and regulations, alternatives will be developed to guide the management of the site over the next 15 to 20 years. The alternatives will incorporate various zoning and management prescriptions to ensure resource preservation and public enjoyment of the site. The environmental consequences that could result from implementing the various alternatives will be evaluated in the plan. Impact topics will include cultural and natural resources, visitor experience, park operations, the socioeconomic environment, impairment, and sustainability. The public will be invited to express opinions about the management of the site early in the process through public meetings and other media; and will have an opportunity to review and comment on a draft GMP/EIS. Following public review processes outlined under NEPA, the final plan will become official, authorizing implementation of a preferred alternative. The target date for the Record of Decision is December 2007.

Dated: November 22, 2004.

**Vidal Martinez,**

*Superintendent, George Washington Birthplace National Monument.*

[FR Doc. 04-27606 Filed 12-17-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312-52-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for an Elk Management Plan, Wind Cave National Park, SD

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

**SUMMARY:** Under the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the National Park Service (NPS) is preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) for an Elk Management Plan for Wind Cave National Park (WICA), South Dakota. An elk management plan is needed to manage the elk population within established acceptable levels, to identify a range of elk management strategies that are compatible with long-term protection of other park resources and natural ecosystems and processes, and to test for and manage disease situations in the elk population. A number of factors contribute to the need for this plan. The elk population within the park has fluctuated since reintroduction and dictated both lethal and translocation control in the past. Due to the insufficient number of predators and the limited movement of elk in and out of the park, the elk population will likely continue to grow unchecked. Excessive browsing caused by high densities of elk may adversely affect mixed-grass prairie and other forage, as well as cultural resources in the park. Furthermore, this plan is needed because the NPS has the responsibility to manage the elk population within the park at levels that are compatible with park goals.

**DATES:** The National Park Service (NPS) intends to conduct public scoping at locations in South Dakota, including Pierre, Sioux Falls, Rapid City, Custer, and Hot Springs. Public scoping is intended to identify issues and concerns that should be addressed in the development of an Elk Management Plan for WICA. To be most helpful to the scoping process, comments should be received within 60 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. See details for sending comments in **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** below. Please check local newspapers, the WICA Web site at <http://www.nps.gov/wica>, or contact the name listed below to find out when and where these open houses will be held and to view draft documents and other current information regarding elk management and the EIS. In addition to this scoping process, there will be additional opportunities to comment on the plan throughout the planning process, including the draft and final document.

**ADDRESSES:** Information will be available for public review and comment at WICA headquarters located 14 miles north of Hot Springs, SD. The address is: Wind Cave National Park, RR1, Box 190, Hot Springs, SD 57747.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tom Farrell, Public Information Officer, or

Linda Stoll, Superintendent, at 605-745-4600.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The NPS seeks to complete an EIS to address elk management at WICA. Section 4.4.2 of the NPS Management Policies (2001) provides for the active management of native animals when management of a population is necessary because it occurs in unnaturally high or low numbers because of human influence. An elk management strategy is needed at WICA because past and current actions within and beyond the park have created conditions that allow the WICA elk population to increase with little or no control. These conditions include the insufficient number of elk predators, the limited effectiveness of public hunting outside of the park as a population control method for elk that range primarily within the park, lack of significant winter kill and other environmentally-caused elk mortalities, high reproductive and survival rates, and the discontinuation of translocating elk from the park.

Elk were reintroduced to the park in 1913 to restore an extirpated native species. The park is surrounded by thirty-seven miles of 7 foot high and four miles of 4.5 foot high woven-wire fence. This fence was designed to allow for movement of most wildlife, yet confines bison within the park. Wolves and bears have been extirpated since the late 1800s, and effective natural predation on ungulates is limited to that which occurs by mountain lions, coyotes and bobcats. Since elk reintroduction in 1913, the population has doubled approximately every 3 years. Research was conducted in the mid-1960s and again in 2003 to provide insight into the forage requirements of elk and other grazers in the park. The resulting data, which considers the forage needs of all ungulates in the park, suggested the park could maintain approximately 350-400 elk. Since reintroduction, the population has exceeded 400 at various times, prompting the removal of animals by both lethal and translocation means. In the fall of 2002, chronic wasting disease (CWD) was found in the park. The NPS policy dictates that translocation of elk may only occur if the animals are free of disease, which removes the possibility of translocation of animals from WICA. Currently, the elk herd numbers about 700, exceeding the maximum number of animals that data suggest can be sustained long-term without negatively affecting other park resources.

A determination of the effects of the elk management plan will be conducted

in accordance with NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4372 *et seq.*), NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1500–1508), other appropriate Federal regulations, and NPS procedures and policies for compliance with those regulations.

The South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Department will serve as a Cooperating Agency in the preparation of the EIS, per NEPA guidelines.

If you wish to comment on the scoping brochure or any other issues associated with the plan, you may submit your comments by any one of several methods. Written comments may be mailed or hand-delivered to the Superintendent at the address above. You may e-mail comments to [wica\\_forum@nps.gov](mailto:wica_forum@nps.gov). Please submit internet comments as a text file and avoid the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Please put in the subject line "Elk Management Plan," and include your name and return address in your message. If you do not receive a confirmation from the system that we have received your message, contact Tom Farrell, Public Information Officer, at the number listed above.

Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review during regular business hours. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their home addresses from the record, which we will honor to the extent allowable by law. There also may be circumstances in which we would withhold from the record a respondent's identity, as allowable by law. If you wish us to withhold your name and/or address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety.

Dated: August 20, 2004.

**Ernest Quintana,**

*Regional Director, Midwest Region.*

[FR Doc. 04–27611 Filed 12–16–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–AL–P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 104–TAA–7 and AA1921–198–200 (Second Review)]

### Sugar From Belgium, European Union, France, and Germany

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of Commission determinations to conduct full five-year

reviews concerning the countervailing duty order on sugar from the European Union and the antidumping findings on sugar from Belgium, France, and Germany.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission hereby gives notice that it will proceed with full reviews 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 countervailing duty order on sugar from the European Union and the antidumping findings on sugar from Belgium, France, and Germany would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. A schedule for the reviews will be established and announced at a later date. For further information concerning the conduct of these reviews 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).

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* December 6, 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 these reviews may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On December 6, 2004, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews in the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Act.<sup>1</sup> The Commission found that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (69 FR 53466, September 1, 2004) was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response to its notice of institution was inadequate. The Commission also found that other

<sup>1</sup> Commissioners Marcia E. Miller and Jennifer A. Hillman dissented, voting to conduct expedited reviews on the basis that the domestic interested party group response was adequate but the respondent interested party group response was inadequate.

circumstances warranted conducting full reviews. 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:** These reviews are 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.

Issued: December 13, 2004.

By order of the Commission.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 04–27650 Filed 12–16–04; 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 fringe benefits which are determined to be prevailing for the described classes of laborers and mechanics employed on construction projects of a similar character and in the localities specified therein.

The determinations in these decisions of prevailing rates and fringe benefits have been made in accordance with 29 CFR part 1, by authority of the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1494, as amended, 40 U.S.C. 276a) and of other Federal statutes referred to in 29 CFR part 1, Appendix, as well as such additional statutes as may from time to time be enacted containing provisions for the payment of wages determined to be prevailing by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. The prevailing rates and fringe benefits determined in these decisions shall, in accordance with the provisions of the foregoing statutes, constitute the minimum wages payable on Federal and federally assisted construction projects to laborers and mechanics of the specified classes engaged on contract work of the character and in the localities described therein.