

Dated: March 12, 2007.

**Anthony J. Schetzle,**  
Deputy Director, Intermountain Region,  
National Park Service.  
[FR Doc. E7-7739 Filed 4-23-07; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4312-CX-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### Notice of Availability for the Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Niobrara National Scenic River General Management Plan, Nebraska

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

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of the Record of Decision (ROD) Niobrara National Scenic River (Scenic River) General Management Plan/final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Scenic River. On March 26, the Midwest Regional Director approved the ROD for the project. As soon as practicable, the NPS will begin to implement the Preferred Alternative contained in the final EIS issued on February 23.

Management Alternative B develops a vision for cooperative management of the Scenic River, with the NPS providing stewardship directly and through Federal, State, and local partners on a landscape that would remain largely in private ownership. The alternative's boundary protects, as equitably as possible, the river's outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, and paleontological values. This alternative encompasses 23,074 acres and is within the acreage limitations of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

This course of action and three alternatives were analyzed in the draft and the final EIS. The full range of foreseeable environmental consequences was assessed and appropriate mitigating measures were identified.

The ROD 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, a listing of measures to minimize environmental harm, and an overview of public involvement in the decisionmaking process.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Superintendent, Niobrara National

Scenic River, P.O. Box 591, O'Neill, Nebraska 68763, or by calling 402-336-3970. Copies of the final EIS and ROD are available upon request from the above address or may be viewed online at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/>.

Dated: March 29, 2007.

**Ernest Quintana,**  
Regional Director, Midwest Region.  
[FR Doc. E7-7745 Filed 4-23-07; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4312-BM-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### Construction of New Utah Museum of Natural History, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Salt Lake County, UT

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability of a Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Construction and Operation of a Proposed New Utah Museum of Natural History at the University of Utah.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to § 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 83 Stat. 852, 853, codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the National Park Service and the University of Utah announce the availability of the Record of Decision for the Construction and Operation of a Proposed New Utah Museum of Natural History at the University of Utah, Salt Lake County, Utah. On March 26, 2007, the Director, Intermountain Region approved the Record of Decision for the project. As soon as practicable, the University of Utah will begin to implement the Preferred Alternative contained in the FEIS issued on February 23, 2007. The following course of action will occur under the preferred alternative: the new museum building will be built uphill from the pipeline corridor/Bonneville Shoreline Trail that pass through the new site. Parking will be provided in a joint Red Butte Garden and Arboretum/Utah Museum of Natural History facility, or if a joint facility is not viable, downhill from the pipeline corridor. Flexibility is afforded for site design and placement of facilities. A portion of the development area extends into Red Butte Garden and Arboretum property. This course of action and five alternatives were analyzed in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. The full range of foreseeable environmental consequences was assessed, and

appropriate mitigating measures were identified.

The 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 listing of measures to minimize environmental harm, and an overview of public involvement in the decision-making process.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Ralph E. Becker, The Shipley Group and Bear West, 1584 South 500 West, Suite 201, Woods Cross, Utah 84010; phone 801-355-8816; e-mail to [rbecker@bearwest.com](mailto:rbecker@bearwest.com).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Copies of the Record of Decision may be obtained from the contact listed above or online at <http://www.umnh.utah.edu>.

Dated: March 26, 2007.

**Anthony J. Schetzle,**  
Deputy Director, Intermountain Region,  
National Park Service.  
[FR Doc. E7-7742 Filed 4-23-07; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4312-52-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-60,882]

#### Camaco, LLC; Mariana Division, Marianna, AR; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated April 4, 2007, a company official requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA). The denial notice was signed on March 16, 2007 and published in the **Federal Register** on March 30, 2007 (72 FR 15168).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a mis-interpretation of facts or