Comment: Why is this data collection necessary? Any evaluation asked of the Directors should center on grantees' opinions of regulations, how the new requirements affect project performance, and other questions about the direction Senior Corps is taking.

Response: The products of the surveys will be updated National Accomplishment Reports for each of the three Senior Corps programs. The information contained in these reports cannot be compiled with any existing information collection systems.

With respect to regulations changes, Senior Corps project directors and other members of the public use the **Federal Register** public comment periods to provide feedback.

It is hoped that information from these surveys of volunteer stations will provide project directors with insight about the way they manage and place volunteers, and how Senior Corps grantees can strengthen relationships with volunteer stations.

Comment: This study will only collect data on outputs, which is less meaningful than data on outcomes. Outcomes measure the difference programs make in their community.

Response: Reports based on outputs are important enough to warrant reinstatement. Concrete accomplishment information, such as how many houses RSVP volunteers helped to construct; how many juvenile offenders Foster Grandparents helped to support in work release placements; or how many miles Senior Companions drove their frail senior clients serve as a solid foundation upon which to build longer term outcomes, which will be the second part of this survey process. Combining accomplishment information obtained through this survey process with other data collected in progress reports will allow the Corporation and its Senior Corps grantees to describe the programs from many perspectives at the national level.

Comment: The proposal is for the accomplishment surveys to be sent directly to stations. This is not appropriate given the lack of business relationship between the Corporation and Senior Corps stations, will result in a limited number of surveys being returned, and will result in incomplete data.

Response: The survey plan calls for Senior Corps project directors to receive information about volunteer stations in their networks selected to participate. As a next step, survey instruments will be sent to the Senior Corps grantees to deliver to the selected volunteer stations. In this way, the process is identical to what is described in the comment. The survey plan calls for Senior Corps project directors to receive information about volunteer stations in their networks selected to participate. As a next step, survey instruments will be sent to the Senior Corps grantees to deliver to the selected volunteer stations.

Comment: The last accomplishment survey was over 20 pages. Stations are already overwhelmed by paperwork from many, many sources. This will also decrease the number of surveys returned.

Response: The revised survey instrument is considerably shorter for RSVP than it was for the last version of the Accomplishment Surveys. In addition, the survey design allows for volunteer stations affiliated with RSVP and Foster Grandparent projects to only receive and complete the section(s) of the survey applicable to the Senior Corps volunteer serving there.

Type of Review: Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired.

Agency: Corporation for National and Community Service.

Title: Accomplishments Surveys of National Senior Service Corps Programs.

OMB Number: Previously assigned 3045–0049.

Agency Number: None.

Affected Public: Foster Grandparent, Senior Companion, and Retired and Senior Volunteer programs, and staff of agencies and organizations serving as volunteer stations for volunteers from those programs.

Type of Respondents: Volunteer coordinators in volunteer stations.

Total Respondents: 2,500.

Frequency: March and April, 2004.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 1,875 hours total for all respondents/sites. There are no Capital Costs, Operating Costs and/or Maintenance Costs to report.

Dated: February 22, 2004.

David A. Reingold,

Director, Office of Research and Policy Development.

[FR Doc. 04–4377 Filed 2–26–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6050–$$–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Availability of Non-Exclusive, Exclusive License or Partially Exclusive Licensing of U.S. Patent Concerning Camouflage Pattern for Sheet Material

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with 37 CFR part 404.6, announcement is made of the availability for licensing of U.S. Patent No. US D486,650 S "Camouflage Pattern for Sheet Material'' issued February 17, 2004. This patent has been assigned to the United States government as represented by the Secretary of the Army.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert Rosenkrans at U.S. Army Soldier Systems Center, Kansas Street, Natick, MA 01760, phone; (508) 233–4928 or e-mail: *Robert.Rosenkrans@natick.army.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Any licenses granted shall comply with 35 U.S.C. 209 and 37 CFR part 404.

Luz D. Ortiz,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–4381 Filed 2–26–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Availability for Non-Exclusive, Exclusive, or Partially Exclusive Licensing of U.S. Provisional Patent Application Concerning 2-Guanidinylimidazolinedione Compounds and Methods of Making and Using Thereof

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with 37 CFR 404.6 and 404.7, announcement is made of the availability for licensing of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/523,670 entitled "2-Guanidinylimidazolinedione Compounds and Methods of Making and Using Thereof,'' filed November 21, 2003. The United States Government, as represented by the Secretary of the Army, has rights in this invention.

ADDRESSES: Commander, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, ATTN: Command Judge Advocate, MCMR–JA, 504 Scott Street, Fort Detrick, Frederick, MD 21702–5012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For patent issues, Ms. Elizabeth Arwine, Patent Attorney, (301) 619–7808. For licensing issues, Dr. Paul Mele, Office of Research & Technology Assessment, (301) 619–6664, both at telefax (301) 619–5034.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The present invention relates to 2-guanidinylimidazolinedione

compounds, methods of making and purifying 2-guanidinylimidazolinedione compounds, and methods of using the 2-guanidinylimidazolinedione compounds to prevent, treat, or inhibit malaria in a subject.

Luz D. Ortiz,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–4380 Filed 2–26–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report for the Santa Ana River Interceptor Protection/ Relocation Project, Reach 9, Orange County, Riverside County and San Bernardino County, CA

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The project area, Reach 9 of the Santa Ana River, includes the approximate 12 kilometer (7.4 mile) section of the River immediately downstream of Prado Dam ending at Weir Canyon Road in the City of Anaheim. The portion of the Santa Ana River Interceptor (SARI) sewage line that extends through this area is in potential jeopardy due to planned increases in flows from the Prado Dam. This segment will either need to be relocated out of the floodplain, or protected in place. Four general alternatives are being considered: (1) Relocate the pipeline to the North; (2) Relocate the pipeline to the South; (3) Protect the pipeline in place; or (4) No action. A combination of alternatives may also be considered.

ADDRESSES: Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, Ecosystem Planning Section, CESPL–PD–RN, P.O. Box 532711, Los Angeles, CA 90053–2325.

DATES: A public scoping meeting is scheduled for March 10, 2004 at 7 p.m. at the Yorba Linda Community Center, 4501 Casa Loma Ave., Yorba Linda, CA 92886.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John J. Killeen, Environmental Studies Manager, (213) 452–3861.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. *Authorization.* The study of potential flood control measures for the Santa Ana River Interceptor Relocation/ Protection Project is a part of the Santa Ana River Mainstream Project which was initially authorized by Pub. L. 738, 74th Congress, June 22, 1936. Authorization of the recommended plan for the Santa Ana River Mainstream Project was the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

2. *Background.* The Santa Ana River flows for more than 60 miles through San Bernardino and Riverside Counties which are undergoing extreme urbanization and continues into already heavily urbanized Orange County. The Prado Dam which was designed to protect Orange County does not currently provide sufficient flood protection because of the continual development in the upstream watershed, reduction of the basin storage capacity due to sediment deposition, and other factors. Ongoing improvements and modifications by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to Prado Dam will result in a potential three-fold increase in outflow. The SARI project was constructed as a joint effort of the Orange County Sanitation District and the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority (SAWPA) in 1973. The Reach 9 segment of the SARI Line (the subject portion of the Santa Ana River), originally deeply buried, is now threatened with structural damage because of exposure of the pipe caused by erosion. The ongoing erosion will be greatly exacerbated by the Prado Dam improvement Project. If the pipe is damaged, the untreated wastewater would be introduced into the Santa Ana River and ultimately onto the beaches and into the coastal waters. Downstream Treatment Plants No. 1 and No. 2 could possibly be damaged by sand and debris that would likely be introduced into the broken pipe.

3. *Proposed Action.* Protect in place or relocate the SARI line outside of the floodplain prior to completion of the Corps' Santa Ana River (Prado Dam) flood control project to prevent damages that would likely occur as a result of scouring by the water releases from Prado Dam.

4. *Alternatives.*

a. Alternative 1, No Action/No Project: without the project, the SARI Line (the subject portion in Reach 9 of the Santa Ana River), originally deeply buried, will be threatened with structural damage because of exposure of the pipe caused by erosion.

b. Alternative 2, Protect in Place: Keep the existing SARI Line in use. Protect the existing line by the addition of grade stabilizers to control bed erosion and additional improvements to protect existing manholes. Project will include additional features as required to mitigate habitat and other environmental impacts. Maintenance would be via access roads in the flood plain which were constructed in 2001. The access roads will also need occasional maintenance.

c. Alternative 3, Relocation North of the River: Replace the existing SARI Line between Weir Canyon Road and the Orange/Riverside County Lines with a pipeline on the north side of the River outside of the floodplain. Maintenance of the new portion of the SARI Line will be by way of the bike path beside La Palma Avenue and Yorba Linda and new Anaheim streets. The segment of pipeline within Riverside County would be protected in place.

d. *Alternative 4, Relocation to Edge of South Floodplain-One Yorba Linda Crossing:* Replace the existing SARI Line between the control gate structure east of the SAVI Ranch Development and the Riverside County Line with a new pipeline on the south side of the River. Build a new system to connect Yorba Linda flows to the SARI Line via a pipeline in the bike path beside La Palma Avenue and a siphon under the River near SAVI Ranch to the new SARI Line near the existing control gate structure. Maintenance of the relocated portion of the SARI Line will be by way of the bike path beside Highway 91 and Anaheim Streets. The segment of pipeline within Riverside County would be protected in place.

5. *Scoping Process.*

a. Potential impacts associated with the proposed action will be evaluated. Resource categories that will be analyzed are: land use, physical environment, geology, biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality, ground water, recreational usage, aesthetics, cultural resources, transportation/communications, hazardous waste, socioeconomics and safety.

b. Participation of affected Federal, State and local resource agencies, native American groups and concerned interest groups/individuals is encouraged in the scoping process. Time and location of the Public Scoping meeting will also be announced by means of a letter, public announcements and news releases. Public participation will be especially important in defining the scope of analysis in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environment Impact Report (EIS/EIR), identifying significant environmental issues and impact analysis in the EIS/EIR and providing useful information such as published and unpublished data, personal knowledge of relevant issues and recommending mitigative measures associated with the proposed action. Those interested in providing information or data relevant to the