

**NEW YORK**

John Brown Farm and Gravesite, Lake Placid  
Radeau *LAND TORTOISE*, Lake George

**NORTH CAROLINA**

Cape Hatteras Light Station, Buxton

**PENNSYLVANIA**

Laurel Hill Cemetery, Philadelphia  
Merion Friends Meeting House, Merion Station  
Woodmont, Gladwyne

**TEXAS**

Trevino-Uribe Rancho, San Ygnacio

**VIRGINIA**

Natural Bridge, Rockbridge County  
Robert Russa Moton High School, Farmville  
Woodlawn, Fairfax County

**WISCONSIN**

Milton House, Milton

The committee will also consider the following de-designation:

**CALIFORNIA**

Rock Magnetics Laboratory, Menlo Park

The committee will also consider the following boundary expansions and name changes:

**KANSAS**

Lower Cimarron Spring (formerly Wagon Bed Springs), Grant County

**NEW YORK**

Lower Landing Archeological District (boundary expansion of Old Fort Niagara NHL and name change to Colonial Niagara Historic District), Lewiston

The committee will also be given an introduction and overview to:

**NEW MEXICO**

Camino Real de Los Tejas National Historic Trail

Dated: April 9, 1998.

**Beth Savage,**

*Acting Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, Washington Office.*

[FR Doc. 98-9907 Filed 4-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR****National Park Service****Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Review Committee: Meeting**

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), 5 U.S.C. Appendix (1988), that a meeting of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Review Committee will be held on June 25-27, 1998 in Portland, Oregon.

The Committee will meet in the Colonel Lindberg room at the Downtown Portland Embassy Suites hotel; telephone: 503/279-9000, fax: 503/497-9051, located at 319 SW Pine Street in Portland, Oregon. Meetings will begin each day at 8:30 a.m., and will end at not later than 5:00 p.m. on Thursday and Friday and at 3:00 p.m. on Saturday.

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Review Committee was established by Pub. L. 101-601 to monitor, review, and assist in implementation of the inventory and identification process and repatriation activities required under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

The agenda for this meeting will include update on Federal agency compliance with the statute, the disposition of culturally unidentifiable human remains, and the status of implementation in the Pacific Northwest region of the United States.

This meeting will be open to the public. However, facilities and space for accommodating members of the public are limited. Persons will be accommodated on a first-come, first-served basis. A small block of rooms has been set aside at the Downtown Portland Embassy Suites hotel, at both a reduced rate and a slightly lower rate for government employees. Reservations must be booked by May 25 to reserve at the blocked rate. Please mention that you will be attending the NAGPRA Review Committee Meeting. Any member of the public may file a written statement concerning matters to be discussed with Dr. Francis P. McManamon, Departmental Consulting Archeologist.

Persons wishing further information concerning this meeting, or who wish to submit written statements may contact Dr. Francis P. McManamon, Departmental Consulting Archeologist, National Park Service, 1849 C Street NW, NC340, Washington, DC 20240; telephone: 202/343-8161. Transcripts of the meeting will be available for public inspection approximately eight weeks after the meeting at the office of the Departmental Consulting Archeologist,

800 North Capitol St., NW, Suite 340, Washington, DC.

Dated: April 2, 1998.

**Francis P. McManamon,**

*Departmental Consulting Archeologist, Manager, Archeology and Ethnography Program.*

[FR Doc. 98-9863 Filed 4-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-F

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR****Bureau of Reclamation****Tucson Aqueduct System Reliability Investigation, Central Arizona Project, INT-FES 98-12**

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability on the final environmental impact statement.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (as amended) (NEPA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) has prepared a final environmental impact statement (FEIS) for the Tucson Aqueduct System Reliability Investigation (TASRI) project, Tucson Division, Central Arizona Project (CAP). The FEIS addresses alternatives that have been studied to incorporate short-term delivery reliability into the CAP system for the Tucson area. This short-term reliability would ensure the delivery of CAP water to Tucson area users during periods of planned maintenance outages of the CAP. Reclamation proposes the construction of a 15,000 acre-foot surface storage reservoir, located southwest of the Tucson metropolitan area, to provide reliability to Tucson area CAP water users.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the FEIS are available for public inspection and review at the following locations:

- Bureau of Reclamation, Regional Liaison Office, Room 7624, 1849 C Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20240; telephone (202) 208-6269
- Bureau of Reclamation, Denver Office Library, Building 67, Room 167, Denver Federal Center, 6th and Kipling, Denver, CO 80225; telephone (303) 236-6963
- Bureau of Reclamation, Lower Colorado Regional Director's Office, Nevada Highway and Park Street, Boulder City, NV 89005; telephone (702) 293-8000
- Bureau of Reclamation, Phoenix Area Office, Attn: PXAO-1500, 2222 W. Dunlap Avenue, Suite 100, Phoenix, AZ 85021-2801; telephone (602) 216-3864

- Bureau of Reclamation, Tucson Field Office, 4257 W. Ina Road, Suite 101, Tucson, AZ 85742; telephone (520) 744-5180

**Libraries:** Copies of the FEIS are also available for inspection at the following libraries: County Courthouse Law Library, University of Arizona Main Library, City Hall Annex Library, and the City Hall Government Reference Library (9th Floor), in Tucson, AZ; Arizona State University Hayden Library, (Arizona Collection), in Tempe, AZ; and the Phoenix (Burton Barr) Public Library in Phoenix, AZ.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Mike Pryor, TASRI Project Manager, PXAO-2500, or Ms. Sandra Eto, NEPA Compliance Specialist, PXAO-1500, Reclamation, PO Box 81169, Phoenix AZ 85069-1169; telephone (602) 216-3931, or 216-3857, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The CAP, authorized as part of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968, is a multipurpose water project which develops water for municipal and industrial use, as well as for Indian uses and non-Indian agricultural uses in central and southern Arizona. Because of Tucson's greater exposure to water service interruptions, the TASRI was initiated in 1986 to study alternatives that would provide as "reasonably reliable" a supply of CAP water to the Tucson area as is available to Phoenix area cities. The FEIS analyzes the environmental consequences of the construction and operation of a 15,000 acre-foot surface storage reservoir (the Agency proposed action), two additional alternatives, and a no Federal action alternative. The FEIS describes environmental consequences to the following resources: Biological, cultural, geologic, air, water, land, recreational, socio-economic, and Indian trust assets. Construction and operation of a surface storage reservoir would provide opportunities for incorporating recreational facilities. A local sponsor(s) would need to agree to be responsible for at least 50 percent of the capital costs to construct the recreational developments, as well as accept responsibility for recreation-related operating and maintenance costs. Reclamation estimates 214 Pima pineapple cacti would be impacted from the proposed action. The Pima pineapple cactus is a federally endangered plant that occurs on the proposed surface storage reservoir site. Fish and Wildlife Service's Biological Opinion for this project indicates implementation of a Reasonable and Prudent Alternative (RPA) will avoid jeopardizing the continued existence of

the Pima pineapple cactus. One of the RPA actions directs Reclamation to establish a refugium for the Pima pineapple cactus that is of similar acreage, cactus population, and of similar or better habitat of the project area, if this proposed action is implemented. Recreational development within the project area is not precluded by the Opinion.

The draft EIS was issued April 18, 1995. Responses to comments received from interested organizations and individuals, both in writing and during two public hearings held in June 1995, are addressed in the FEIS.

Reclamation's development and evaluation of the alternatives described in the FEIS, and selection of the proposed action, were based upon the assumption that the great majority of CAP water allocated to the Tucson metropolitan area would be treated at Tucson Water's Hayden-Udall Water Treatment Plant and delivered for direct use through Tucson Water's delivery system. Many changes have occurred, since the draft EIS was issued for public review and comment in April 1995, related to water management in the Tucson area. Consequently, assumptions that were used in developing and sizing the systems considered under the action alternatives discussed in the FEIS may no longer be valid. In light of the uncertainty regarding future use of CAP water in the region, Reclamation does not intend to issue a Record of Decision in the immediate future regarding implementation of the project. However, the fiscal year 1997 Appropriations Act specifically directed Reclamation to finalize the EIS; therefore, this FEIS is being filed with the Environmental Protection Agency.

Dated: April 10, 1998.

**Robert W. Johnson,**

*Regional Director.*

[FR Doc. 98-9943 Filed 4-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-94-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-383 Sanctions Proceeding]

### Certain Hardware Logic Emulation Systems and Components Thereof; Order No. 100: Setting Procedural Schedule

This sanctions proceeding was instituted, and an Order issued on March 6, 1998. The notice of institution was published in the **Federal Register** on March 12, 1998 (63 FR 12113-4).

Order No. 99, which issued on March 10, ordered each of the parties, no later than March 17, to state its positions on certain points. A telephone conference initiated by the administrative law judge was held on March 17. The reasons for the conference were telephone calls to the attorney-adviser on March 13 from complainant's counsel and on March 16, from counsel for certain respondents and from the staff, requesting that the due date of March 17 be deferred until April 3 (Tr. at 18). During the telephone conference counsel for complainant proposed reply briefs be filed on April 10. Counsel for certain respondents and the staff had no objection to that proposal (Tr. at 37, 38). The administrative law judge thereafter set March 27 for submissions, pursuant to Order No. 99 and April 3 for the filing of reply submissions, by *all* parties named in the Order of March 6 (Tr. at 46, 47). Also the staff was required to report to the administrative law judge on March 27 with respect to any negotiations on settlement (Tr. at 47).

On March 27 responses to Order No. 99 were received from complainant and the staff. Also a response was received from respondents Mentor Graphics Corporation and Meta Systems and certain of their present and former counsel (Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison LLP, Robert DeBerardine, and William Anthony) (Mentor). On April 3, replies were received from complainant and Mentor.

Complainant, in its response, represented that complainant, the staff, respondents Mentor Graphics Corporation and Meta Systems, and the law firm of Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison, LLP (Brobeck law firm) and its individual member parties have not been able to reach agreement on the precise dollar amount of sanctions to be awarded for any or all portions of Order No. 96 in issue and that while the staff has suggested a procedure to follow to arrive at an agreed amount for sanctions among all parties to this proceeding, and the parties are pursuing such procedure to see if agreement is possible, whether agreement will be reached as a result of this procedure will probably not be known until the latter part of April 1998. It was represented that with respect to the issue of making an adequate record for the determination of the sanction amount, complainant does not request nor believe any formal discovery is necessary, not is any evidentiary hearing believed necessary or requested because complainant intends to submit detailed affidavits in support of requested sanctions award. Complainant proposed that by April 17, 1998, it and