

When approved, the plan will guide management actions during the next 15–20 years which are necessary to protect and enhance the “Outstandingly Remarkable Values” (ORVs) for which the river was designated, pursuant to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1271).

Proposal: The proposed Merced River Plan (Alternative 2—Preferred) would provide management direction for the Merced Wild and Scenic River by establishing seven management elements: ORVs, boundaries, classifications, Section 7 determination, River Protection Overlay (RPO), management zoning, and research and monitoring. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requires the first four elements; the final three elements were developed in the Merced River Plan to respond to the Act’s requirement to protect and enhance ORVs. This plan modifies the ORVs, boundaries and classifications from the present situation to respond to public comment, to more accurately respond to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and to reflect updated information. The proposed alternative presents the management elements to guide future decision-making and management actions with the intent that natural processes will prevail.

Alternatives: In addition to the proposal, four other alternatives are identified and analyzed. Alternative 1 (“no action”) is a continuation of the existing situation, based on the ORVs, boundaries, and classifications as published in the 1996 Draft Yosemite Valley Housing Plan/Supplemental EIS. If approved, Alternative 1 will not implement the three management elements—establishment of a RPO, management zoning, and a research and monitoring program—that are not required by the Act. Nor would it present the specific Section 7 determination process outlined in the proposed action.

Alternative 3 differs from the proposed alternative (Alternative 2) with regard to the boundaries, classifications, and management zones. The effect of the differences would promote more resource protection, using a narrower corridor in east Yosemite Valley and in Wawona, within the river corridor than under Alternative 2.

Alternative 4 varies from Alternatives 2 and 3 by presenting yet another combination of boundaries, classifications and management zoning. Of the alternatives presented, Alternative 4 would present the most resource protection within the developed areas along the Merced River.

Alternative 5 presents the same boundaries and classifications as

Alternative 4, but with zoning that would allow for more use and facilities in developed areas than that presented under any of the other action alternatives. In addition, there would be no river protection overlay under Alternative 5, reducing the ability to protect the areas immediately adjacent to the Merced.

Planning Background: The draft and final Merced River Plan/EIS were prepared pursuant to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and National Environmental Policy Act. A Scoping Notice was published in the **Federal Register** on June 11, 1999; and the Notice of Intent was published on August 23, 1999. An intensive scoping phase was undertaken during June and July 1999, which included a series of six public meetings. The invitation letter requesting input into the development of the draft Merced River Plan/EIS was sent to the park’s general mailing list. In addition, the scoping effort was publicized via regional and local media and on the park’s Webpage. As a result of this outreach, over 330 responses were received and used in the development of issues upon which preparation of the draft Merced River Plan/EIS was based. A summary of the scoping process is available on the park’s Webpage (address noted below). On January 7, 2000, a Notice of Availability for the Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan/EIS appeared in the **Federal Register**. A press briefing was held earlier the same week to raise public awareness of the plan. Over 9000 plans were mailed to each person or organization listed on the park’s mailing list. A 70-day public comment period began on January 14, 2000 and ended on March 24, 2000. Fourteen public hearings were held throughout the state of California in January and February. Local press was notified days in advance of each meeting to help raise awareness of the meetings. Yosemite National Park management and planning officials attended all sessions to present the draft Merced River Plan/EIS, to receive oral and written comments, and to answer questions. More than 2300 comments were received by mail, fax, electronic mail, recorded testimony, and other means.

Distribution of MRP/Final EIS: A postcard was mailed to all individuals and organizations on the park’s general mailing list to determine whether a printed copy or a CD-ROM version (or both) of the Merced River Plan/FEIS should be mailed to the respective address. Another option presented on the postcard was to receive nothing by mail, considering that the complete final

plan will be available on the park’s website (<http://www.nps.gov/yose/planning>). Still another option was to receive a “user’s guide” after a Record of Decision is signed. In view of these options, the Merced River Plan/FEIS will be mailed, in format requested, until quantities are exhausted. Copies will also be available at park headquarters in Yosemite Valley, the Warehouse Building in El Portal, and at local and regional libraries (*i.e.*, San Francisco and Los Angeles).

Decision Process: Depending upon the response from other agencies, organizations and the general public, at this time it is anticipated that the notice of an approved Record of Decision would be published in the **Federal Register** not sooner than July 31, 2000 (nor would it be signed until at least 30 days have elapsed after publication by the EPA of the filing notice for the Final MRP/EIS). The official responsible for the decision is the Regional Director, Pacific West Region, National Park Service; the official responsible for implementation is the Superintendent, Yosemite National Park.

Dated: June 23, 2000.

Patricia L. Neubacher,

Acting Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

[FR Doc. 00–16703 Filed 6–30–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places; Notification of Pending Nominations

Nominations for the following properties being considered for listing in the National Register were received by the National Park Service before June 24, 2000. Pursuant to section 60.13 of 36 CFR part 60 written comments concerning the significance of these properties under the National Register criteria for evaluation may be forwarded to the National Register, National Park Service, 1849 C St. NW, NC400, Washington, DC 20240. Written comments should be submitted by July 18, 2000.

Carol D. Shull,

Keeper of the National Register.

Arizona

Yavapai County
Toltec Lodge,
228 High St.,
Prescott, 00000812

Arkansas

Pulaski County

Capitol View Neighborhood Historic District,
Roughly bounded by Riverview Dr.,
Schiller St., W. 7th St. and Woodrow St.
Little Rock, 00000813

Colorado

Larimer County
Mountainside Lodge,
2515 Tunnel Rd.,
Estes Park, 00000814

Connecticut

Litchfield County
Bridgewater Center Historic District,
Roughly along Main St., Warner Rd.,
Clapboard Rd. and Hat Shop Hill,
Bridgewater, 00000816
New Haven County
Pine Orchard Union Chapel,
25 Chapel Dr.,
Branford, 00000815
New London County
Perkins—Bill House,
1040 Long Cove Rd.,
Gales Ferry, 00000817

Minnesota

Goodhue County
Florence Town Hall,
33923 MN 61 Blvd.,
Florence Township, 00000818

Missouri

Cape Girardeau County
Cape Girardeau Commercial Historic District,
(Cape Girardeau, Missouri MPS)
100 Blk. of N. Main St. and 100 Blk. of Broadway,
Cape Girardeau, 00000820
Haarig Commercial Historic District,
(Cape Girardeau, Missouri MPS)
Along sections of the 600 Blk. of Good Hope St. and 300 Blk. of S. Sprigg St.,
Cape Girardeau, 00000819

Nevada

Lander County
Lander County High School,
130 Sixth St.,
Austin, 00000821

New York

Oneida County
Memorial Church of the Holy Cross,
841 Bleecker St.,
Utica, 00000823
Ulster County
Ashokan—Turnwood Covered Bridge,
477 Beaverkill Rd.,
Oliverbridge, 00000822

North Carolina

Chatham County
North Third Avenue Historic District,
Roughly bounded by N. Second Ave., E. Fourth St., N. Third Ave., and E. Third St.,

Siler City, 00000824
Rowan County
Salisbury Historic District (Boundary Increase),
Portions of E. Council, E. Innes, Lee and E. Liberty Sts. bet. Main and Depot Sts.,
Salisbury, 00000826
Transylvania County
Hankel—Barclay House (Boundary Increase),
8 mi. W of Jct. NC 1114 and US 276,
Brevard, 00000825

South Dakota

Minnehaha County
Gloria House, The,
1216 S. Center Ave.,
Sioux Falls, 00000828
Split Rock Creek Park Historic District,
Roughly 1 mi. N of Garretson in Split Rock Park,
Garretson, 00000827

Vermont

Addison County
Union Church, Jct. of River Rd. and East St.,
New Haven, 00000829
Orleans County
House at 68 Highland Avenue,
68 Highland Ave.,
Newport, 00000831
Windsor County
Smith, Samuel Gilbert, Farmstead,
(Agricultural Resources of Vermont MPS)
375 Orchard St.,
Brattleboro, 00000830
A request for a *move* has been made for the following resource

Arkansas

Pulaski County
Compton-Wood House 800 High St.
Little Rock, 80000781
A request for *removal* has been made for the following resources:

Arkansas

Benton County
Sunset Hotel
(Benton County MRA)
US 71
Bella Vista, 92000986
Franklin County
Cabins, The
W of Ozark on AR 219
Ozark vicinity, 77000253
Jackson County
Hickory Grove Church and School
N of Jacksonport
Jacksonport vicinity, 78000595
Pulaski County
Pulaski County Road 67D Bridge
(Historic Bridges of Arkansas MPS)
Co. Rd. 67D over Bridge Cr.
Jacksonville, 95000651

[FR Doc. 00-16782 Filed 6-30-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-722 (Review)]

Honey From China

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of a five-year review concerning the suspended investigation on honey from China.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it has instituted a review pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act) to determine whether termination of the suspended investigation on honey from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act, interested parties are requested to respond to this notice by submitting the information specified below to the Commission;¹ to be assured of consideration, the deadline for responses is August 22, 2000. Comments on the adequacy of responses may be filed with the Commission by September 18, 2000. For further information concerning the conduct of this review 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).

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 3, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mary Messer (202-205-3193) or Vera Libeau (202-205-3176), 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>).

¹ No response to this request for information is required if a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) number is not displayed; the OMB number is 3117-0016/USITC No. 00-5-059, expiration date July 31, 2002. Public reporting burden for the request is estimated to average 7 hours per response. Please send comments regarding the accuracy of this burden estimate to the Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW, Washington, DC 20436.