

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

of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Camaco, LLC, Marianna Division, Marianna, Arkansas engaged in production of automotive parts, such as metal seat frames, brackets and reinforcement was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 was not met. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. The survey revealed no imports of automotive parts, such as metal seat frames, brackets and reinforcement in 2005, 2006 and January of 2007 when compared with January of 2006. The subject firm did not import automotive parts, such as metal seat frames, brackets and reinforcement in the relevant period nor did it shift production to a foreign country.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner stated that the subject firm made parts for a company which shifted production to Mexico. As a result of this shift, the subject firm experienced declines in sales. Therefore, workers of the subject firm should be eligible for TAA and ATAA.

A company official was contacted to verify the business relationship between the subject firm and the alleged company. The company official stated that the company mentioned in the request for reconsideration was not the subject firm's customer and that the subject firm did not sell parts directly to this firm during the relevant time period. Because the alleged company was not the subject firm's customer during the relevant time period, any information regarding business activities of this company is not relevant to this investigation.

The request for reconsideration also states that "some of the equipment that was utilized here at CAMACO-Marianna is being sent to India to be used at a manufacturing facility there for production of automotive parts."

Further contact with the company official confirmed that CAMACO, LLC, Marianna Division, Marianna, Arkansas is planning to shift a portion of its manufacturing equipment from Marianna, Arkansas to India. The company official further indicated that no production has been moved from the Marianna facility to India as of April 12, 2007, and no time line was established to when this may occur.

Should the shift to India occur, the petitioner is encouraged to file a new petition on behalf of workers at the CAMACO, LLC, Marianna Division, Marianna, Arkansas, thereby creating a

relevant period of investigation that would include changing conditions.

The petitioner further refers to the TAA certifications issued to various businesses and industries located in Marianna, Arkansas. The petitioner alleges that because the subject firm has been the largest employer in Marianna, Arkansas and hence other companies in the area were certified eligible for TAA, workers of the subject firm should also be eligible.

A review of other businesses is not relevant to an investigation concerning import impact on workers applying for trade adjustment assistance. As noted above, "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of customers of the workers' firm to examine the direct impact on a specific firm. No increased imports were evidenced during the survey of subject firm's customers and the subject firm did not shift production to a foreign country.

#### Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of April, 2007.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E7-7726 Filed 4-23-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-60,556]

##### **Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc., Including On-Site Leased Workers of Action Staffing (American Services), Greenville, SC; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance**

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), and Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on February 16, 2007, applicable to workers of Hitachi

Electronic Devices (USA), Inc., including on-site leased workers of Action Staffing, Greenville, South Carolina. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on February 27, 2007 (72 FR 8795).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers were engaged in the production of projection tubes for televisions.

New information provided by the subject firm, shows that American Services is the parent company of the leasing firm, Action Staffing. Leased workers separated from employment at the subject firm had their wages reported under the unemployment insurance (UI) tax account for American Services.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to properly reflect this matter.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc. who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-60,556 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc., including on-site leased workers from Action Staffing, American Services, Greenville, South Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after November 25, 2006, through February 16, 2009, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 16th day of April 2007.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E7-7725 Filed 4-23-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Employment and Training Administration

##### **Investigations Regarding Certifications of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance**

Petitions have been filed with the Secretary of Labor under Section 221 (a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") and are identified in the Appendix to this notice. Upon receipt of these petitions, the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, has