

of the beneficiaries of their specific programs. This information is used by the RBS, RHS, RUS, and FSA for compliance review and monitoring purposes for Title VI.

b. Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (as amended) ("Title VIII"). Section 808a of Title VIII (42 U.S.C. 3608a (1988)), in pertinent part, requires the Secretary of Agriculture to collect racial and ethnic data on beneficiaries and recipients of USDA's housing programs. Furthermore, the implementing regulations issued by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and adopted by the RBS, RHS, RUS, and FSA, requires recipients and other participants in RHS's housing programs affirmatively to further fair housing by providing housing, and the opportunity to acquire housing in a non-discriminatory fashion. One way to demonstrate compliance with Title VIII is to prepare Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plans, and to collect and maintain data to reflect compliance with the requirements of that plan. Furthermore, under the Memorandum of Understanding between HUD and USDA, many complaints of fair housing violations by USDA recipients will be processed by HUD. The collection and maintenance of this data will assist in the enforcement effort.

c. Executive Order 11246. The implementing regulations issued by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), and adopted by the RBS, RHS, RUS, and FSA, require recipients of federally assisted construction contracts of \$10,000 or more to maintain goals for hiring minorities and females, and to submit employment utilization reports to the DOL's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs.

The information collected and maintained by the recipients of certain programs from RBS, RHS, RUS, and FSA is used internally by these agencies for monitoring compliance with the civil rights laws and regulations. This information is made available to USDA officials, officials of other Federal agencies, and to Congress for reporting purposes. Without the required information, RBS, RHS, RUS, FSA and its recipients will lack the necessary documentation to demonstrate that their programs are being administered in a nondiscriminatory manner, and in full compliance with the civil rights laws. In addition, the RBS, RHS, RUS, FSA, and their recipients would be vulnerable in lawsuits alleging discrimination in the affected programs of these agencies, and would be without appropriate data and documentation to defend themselves by demonstrating that services and benefits

are being provided to beneficiaries on an equal opportunity basis.

*Estimate of Burden:* The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 5.41 hours per response.

*Respondents:* Recipients of RBS, RHS, RUS, and FSA's Federal financial assistance, loan, and loan guarantee programs.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 54,653.

*Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent:* 1.99.

*Estimated Number of Responses:* 108,534.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 587,568.

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from Tracy Givelekian, Regulations and Paperwork Management Branch, Support Services Division, at (202) 692-0039.

#### Comments

*Comments are invited on:* (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Rural Development, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agencies' 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 Tracy Givelekian, Regulations and Paperwork Management Branch, Support Services Division, Rural Development U.S. Department of Agriculture, Ag Box 0742, Washington, DC 20250-0742. 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 13, 2004.

**Gilbert G. Gonzalez,**

*Acting Under Secretary, Rural Development.*

Dated: October 13, 2004.

**J.B. Penn,**

*Under Secretary, Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.*

[FR Doc. 04-23578 Filed 10-20-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-XV-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### **Bridger-Teton National Forest—Pinedale Ranger District; Wyoming; Moose-Gypsum Environmental Impact Statement**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Service proposes a number of project actions within the Moose-Gypsum Project Area. These actions are designed to move these areas closer to the desired Future Conditions as described in the Bridger-Teton National Forest's Land and Resource Management Plan. The Pinedale Ranger District is proposing a 1,500-acre timber harvest in conifer stands; 1,100 acres of mechanical aspen stand improvement treatments; 600 acres of Wildland/Urban Interface fuels treatments; 29,000 acres of sage/grass/aspen treatments to be accomplished primarily with prescribed burning and possibly with the use of an herbicide sage-reduction treatment on approximately 8,000 acres. Watershed restoration projects, such as the replacement of storm damaged culverts and rehabilitation of damaged stream banks on the Green River are also projects included in this proposal. Recreation project improvements included as a part of this analysis are a rerouting of the district's snowmobile trail around the elk winter feed ground, the development of a dispersed campsite management plan, and new trailhead design and reconstruction. Road management improvements, including the refinement of the existing travel plan to consider All Terrain Vehicle routes and wilderness trespass issues, the obliteration and rehabilitation of a roadbed within the Wilderness, and an upgrade of the Green River Lakes Road to a higher standard are also proposed for analysis in this environmental impact statement.

**DATES:** Comments concerning the scope of the analysis must be received by November 12, 2004. The draft environmental impact statement is expected May 2005, and the final environmental impact statement is expected October 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Craig Trulock, District Ranger, Pinedale Ranger District, P.O. Box 220, Pinedale, Wyoming 82941. Electronic comments may be sent to; *comments-intermt-n-bridger-teton-pinedale@fs.fed.us* with the subject line "Moose-Gypsum EIS."

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Craig Trulock, District Ranger, Pinedale

Ranger District, Bridger-Teton National Forest, U.S. Forest Service 307-367-4326.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Upper Green River Watershed is approximately 25 miles north of Pinedale, Wyoming, in the Green River drainage, on the west slope of the Wind River mountain range. The smaller project area within the boundaries of the Upper Green River Watershed is approximately 110,397 acres of National Forest System lands administered by the Pinedale Ranger District of the Bridger-Teton National Forest. The Upper Green River Watershed is comprised of the tributary creeks of the Green River and these include Moose Creek, Gypsum Creek, Roaring Fork, Boulder Creek and Wagon Creek. The subwatershed of two of these creeks, Moose Creek and Gypsum Creek and portion of the Green River watershed itself, are defined as the project area to be analyzed in this environmental impact statement. The legal description of the project area under consideration includes portions of T37N, R109W; T38N, R109/110W; T39N, R108/109/110W; T40N, R108/109/110W.

#### Purpose and Need for Action

The Moose-Gypsum EIS is being analyzed for the purpose of responding to the goals and objectives of the Bridger-Teton Forest Plan, in order to move the project area toward the Desired Future Conditions described in that plan. The 1999 Upper Green Landscape Assessment (LSA) analyzed integrated resource conditions in the project area. The LSA more specifically identified and described Desired Future Conditions for a variety of resources. In 2004, the Gypsum Watershed Analysis was completed, further clarifying the Desired Future Conditions for some resources. The Purpose and Need for this project is to consider actions that attain, or take the initial steps toward attaining, these resources' Desired Future Conditions. There are a number of components related to current resource conditions that are in need of improvement, and these include:

- Reintroduction of fire into the area as a natural disturbance tool. Fire will be used to achieve a number of objectives ranging from habitat improvement, rangeland improvement, fuels reduction, and treatment of Aspen stands that are predominantly old age classes, are being encroached on by conifers, and are declining in growth and health.
- Attention to the overall health of the watersheds of Moose and Gypsum Creeks through road surface

improvement, culvert replacement and other watershed restoration activities.

- Modification of the compositions of some of the vegetative species within the project area in order to move them toward historic vegetation compositions, which is the Desired Future Conditions for these vegetation species. A majority of the conifer stands in the project area are in older age classes that are declining in growth and health, accumulating heavy fuels loads and higher tree densities than are healthy for their site conditions. The Desired Future Condition would be to maintain a healthy variety: a percentage of stands in seedling/sapling stages, for example, with preservation of the forest structure in snags, down logs, tree clumps, lower tree densities and promotion of natural regeneration.

- Reduction of the risk of catastrophic wildfire by reduction of the hazardous fuels loads around private land through vegetation management.

- Management of the timber resource for production of saw timber and other wood products from suitable timberlands available for timber harvest on an even-flow, long term, sustained yield basis, and in an economically-efficient manner.

- Provision of a diversity of opportunities for resource uses that contribute to the local and regional economies of northwestern Wyoming.

- Improvement of recreation opportunities and the quality of recreational experiences through the development of a dispersed camping plan for the project area to protect sensitive areas such as streams and river banks, updating the 1996 Pinedale Ranger District's Travel Management Plan in order to address Off-Highway Vehicle issues such as wilderness trespass, closure violations, and to ensure that choices for open and closed roads are appropriate.

#### Proposed Action

A Proposed Action is defined early in the project-level planning process. It serves as a starting point for the Interdisciplinary Team and gives the public and agencies information on which to focus comments. The Proposed action presented here will be updated using the comments received, preliminary analysis and additional field information obtained prior to the Draft EIS. The Proposed Action of this project is to complete a variety of projects within the area under analysis to meet Desired Future Conditions, goals and objectives identified for the various resources under consideration in this EIS. Vegetation treatments within the project are designed to move the

vegetation to more historic species and age class compositions. These vegetation treatments will take place over an extended time period of up to ten years.

Following are general descriptions of the type of projects being proposed and analyzed:

##### 1. *Conifer Vegetation Treatments.*

Conifer treatments are proposed to thin overstocked conifer forests while maintaining a forested appearance. The objective is to leave the healthiest trees of diverse species while reducing losses caused by insects and disease and salvaging wood products. These treatments will take place in older stands where tree growth is greatly reduced or where mortality of trees exceeds growth. The remaining trees will better utilize the nutritional resources available on their sites and continuously provide habitat for forest-dependent species. Additional treatments will provide for regeneration of the declining Lodgepole pine, Whitebark pine and mixed conifer forests and enhanced age class diversity across the landscape. These treatments entail removing most merchantable trees through a commercial timber sale. Regeneration of healthy new stands will be ensured by planting with Lodgepole pine or Englemann spruce and/or providing for natural regeneration. Individual and groups of healthy seed trees and snags, and groups of healthy non-merchantable trees, will be left for seed, habitat, and diversity, where they are available. Age class diversity is important to reduce losses caused by insects and disease and will reflect historically occurring conditions. Treatments to be analyzed include: shelterwood harvest, overstory-removal harvest, clearcut harvest, group-selection harvest and salvage harvest.

2. *Aspen Treatments.* A combination of mechanical treatments (which may include harvesting, pushing over, or other regeneration methods) and burning (broadcast and pile) of aspen and encroaching conifer to rejuvenate aspen stands.

##### 3. *Sage and Grass Treatments.*

Primarily burning with some use of sagebrush herbicides. The objectives are wildlife habitat improvement, rangeland improvement, sage encroached aspen, and reestablishment of diverse age structures.

4. *Fuels Reduction Treatments.* A combination of mechanical treatments and burning (broadcast and pile) will be utilized to reduce fuel loadings around private lands. Down wood will be removed, understory ladder fuels will be pruned and a thinning from below of dense understory will open the

understory to reduce risk from crown fires.

5. *Watershed Improvements.* Forest roads will be improved to minimize existing sedimentation into adjacent streams, improve drainage, and reduce continual maintenance needs. This will entail culvert replacement and maintenance as part of the harvest operations. Existing roads provide access to many of the treatment areas. Some additional skid roads may be needed to reach into the stands. After treatments are completed, these skid roads would be closed and obliterated and allowed to regenerate naturally, or seeded, depending upon the site.

6. *Travel Plan Update.* The Pinedale Ranger District's Travel Plan needs to be updated in some areas within the Gypsum Creek drainage and the Upper Green River drainage. Several problems exist including wilderness trespass, erosion problems that are adding sediment to streams and travel in areas that have been closed. These could lead to road closures of some routes, and maintenance and relocation of other routes that are causing problems. Several opportunities exist to provide additional travel routes open to OHVs. These include constructing short segments connecting two existing travel routes providing loop OHV trails, and provide additional OHV routes in certain other areas.

7. *Recreation Planning.* A dispersed camping plan has been developed to establish new dispersed campsites while closing some dispersed sites that are in sensitive areas such as next to stream banks. Several problems exist along the Green River and Gypsum Creek, where dispersed camp sites are too close to the streams. This has caused trampling of the vegetation along the stream banks leading to increased erosion and sedimentation into the streams. The objective will be to provide dispersed camping opportunities while correcting erosion and sedimentation problems. Where opportunities allow, the dispersed campsites will be moved 200 feet away from the streams. Where the use cannot be moved, those campsites will be closed and other campsites in adjacent areas will be opened to accommodate this use.

#### **Possible Alternatives**

The Environmental Impact Statement will analyze at least three alternatives: The "No Action" alternative, which will detail the consequences of doing nothing in all the project categories included in the variety of projects of the Proposed Action; the effects of the "Proposed Action" will be analyzed; and an "Alternative Action" may be

formulated from acceptable portions of the Proposed Action. The scoping process and environmental analysis will evaluate the feasibility of alternatives to the proposed action.

#### **Responsible Official**

Craig Trulock, District Ranger,  
Pinedale Ranger District, P.O. Box 220,  
Pinedale, Wyoming 82941.

#### **Nature of Decision To Be Made**

The decision, which will be based upon the analyses described above, will be whether or not the Proposed Project, or portions of the Proposed Project, will further the Pinedale District's attainment of the Desired Future Conditions described in the Bridger-Teton National Forest's Land and Resource Management Plan. The decision will also identify needed mitigation measures during the analysis process, in addition to the any prescribed in the Land and Resource Management Plan.

#### **Scoping Process**

The Forest Service is seeking information, comments, and assistance from individuals, organizations and Federal, State, and local agencies that may be interested in or affected by the proposed action (36 CFR 219.6).

Public comments will be used and disclosed in the environmental analysis documented in the Moose-Gypsum EIS. Public participation will be solicited by notifying in person, and/or by mail, known interested and affected parties. A legal notice and news releases will be used to give the public general notice. Open houses will be held from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. on Wednesday, November 3, 2004. Forest Service and Bionomics, Inc., (environmental consultants) will be available to explain the project, answer questions and record public input.

A reasonable range of alternatives will be evaluated and reasons will be given for eliminating alternatives from detailed study. A "no-action alternative" is required by law, which means that the consequences of not doing the Proposed Action will be evaluated. Alternatives will be formulated in response to public issues, management concerns, existing condition reports and resource opportunities identified during the scoping process.

#### **Comments Requested**

This Notice of Intent initiates the scoping process which guides the development of the Moose-Gypsum 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. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental impact statement stage 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 30 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 2.1.)

Dated: October 14, 2004.

**Craig Trulock,**

*District Ranger, Pinedale Ranger District,  
Bridger-Teton National Forest.*

[FR Doc. 04-23614 Filed 10-20-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-M**

## COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

### Membership of the USCCR Performance Review Board

**AGENCY:** U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

**ACTION:** Notice of membership of the USCCR Performance Review Board.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the appointment of the Performance Review Board (PRB) of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Publication of PRB membership is required by 5 U.S.C. 4314(c)(4).

The PRB provides fair and impartial review of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' Senior Executive Service performance appraisals and makes recommendations regarding performance ratings and performance awards to the Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for the FY2003 rating year.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Janice Minor, Human Resources Assistant, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 624 9th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20425, (202) 376-8364.

Members: Gloria Gutierrez, Deputy Administrator for Management, Food and Nutrition Service, USDA; Jill M. Crumpacker, Director, Policy & Performance Management, Chief, Human Capitol Officer, Federal Labor Relations Authority; Joseph Mancias, Senior Management Counsel, Department Homeland Security.

**TinaLouise Martin,**

*Director of Human Resources, U.S.  
Commission on Civil Rights.*

[FR Doc. 04-23573 Filed 10-20-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6335-01-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-427-098]

### Anhydrous Sodium Metasilicate From France: Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

**ACTION:** Notice of revocation of the antidumping duty order on anhydrous sodium metasilicate from France.

**SUMMARY:** On September 1, 2004, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a second sunset review of the antidumping duty order on anhydrous sodium metasilicate from France. *See Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Reviews*, 69 FR 53408 (September 1, 2004). Because no domestic party responded to the sunset review notice of initiation by the applicable deadline, the Department is revoking the antidumping duty order on anhydrous sodium metasilicate from France.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 21, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Martha V. Douthit, Office of Policy, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5050.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Scope

Imports covered by this order covers anhydrous sodium metasilicate from France, a crystallized silicate which is alkaline and readily soluble in water. Applications include waste paper de-inking, ore-flotation, bleach stabilization, clay processing, medium or heavy duty cleaning, and compounding into other detergent formulations. This merchandise is classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedules of the United States ("HTSUS") item numbers 2839.11.00 and 2839.19.00. The HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

##### Background

On January 7, 1981, the Department issued an antidumping duty order on anhydrous sodium metasilicate from France. *See Anhydrous Sodium Metasilicate From France, Antidumping Duty Order*, 46 FR 1667 (January 7, 1981). On October 21, 1999, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4), the Department published in the **Federal Register** its notice of continuation of the antidumping duty order following the first sunset review. *See Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order: Anhydrous Sodium Metasilicate From France*, 64 FR 56737 (October 21, 1999). On September 1, 2004, the Department initiated a second sunset review of this order pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, (the "Act"), and 19 CFR part 351, in general.

*See Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Review*, 69 FR 53408 (September 1, 2004). As a courtesy to interested parties, the Department sent letters, via certified and registered mail, to each party listed on the Department's most current service list for this proceeding to inform them of the automatic initiation of a sunset review of this order. We received no response from the domestic industry by the deadline date. *See* 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i). As a result, the Department determined that no domestic party intends to participate in the sunset review. On September 21, 2004, the Department notified the International Trade Commission ("ITC") in writing that we intended to issue a final determination revoking this antidumping duty order. *See* 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(iii)(B).

#### Determination To Revoke

Pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(iii)(B)(3), if no domestic interested party responds to the notice of initiation, the Department shall issue a final determination, within 90 days after the initiation of the review, revoking the order. Because no domestic interested party filed a notice of intent to participate or a substantive response, the Department finds that no domestic interested party is participating in this review. Therefore, we are revoking this antidumping duty order effective October 21, 2004, the fifth anniversary of the date of the determination to continue the order, consistent with 19 CFR 351.222(i)(2)(i) and section 751(c)(6)(A)(iii) of the Act.

#### Effective Date of Revocation

Pursuant to sections 751(c)(3)(A) and 751(c)(6)(A)(iii) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.222(i)(2)(i), the Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to terminate the suspension of liquidation of the merchandise subject to this order entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, on or after October 21, 2004. Entries of subject merchandise prior to the effective date of revocation will continue to be subject to suspension of liquidation and antidumping duty deposit requirements. The Department will complete any pending administrative reviews of this order and will conduct administrative reviews of subject merchandise entered prior to the effective date of revocation in response to appropriately filed requests for review.

This five-year ("sunset") review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.