

condoned continued reactive rather than proactive federal involvement in all matters of visitor use and development, resource management, and interpretation. Alternative 1 served chiefly as a baseline for comparing the Preferred Alternative and Alternative 3. Alternative 3, the so-called recreation emphasis alternative, would have shifted focus to recreational enhancements and development at the potential occasional expense of resource enhancement and management. Most management actions prescribed therein were also present in alternative 2, but the recreational interests were more heavily weighted.

The boundary in Alternative 1 would have remained the same as described in the 1978 legislation. The boundaries for Alternatives 2 and 3 were identical. Both boundaries include important examples of the river's outstandingly remarkable values.

#### Public Review

More than 1,000 copies of the Draft GMP/EIS were mailed to federal, state, tribal, and local officials, organizations, and individuals in October 1998, commencing a 60-day public comment period that closed December 16, 1998. Between November 12 and December 10 public meetings were held in Hartington, Ponca, and Newcastle, Nebraska; and Vermillion and Yankton, South Dakota. The Missouri River Bank Stabilization Association was briefed on November 23, Nebraska Game and Parks officials on November 24, the Cedar County Commission on December 8, and Nebraska and South Dakota Congressional staff on December 9.

A total of 836 written comments were received during the public review period, including 779 identical cards from the Sierra Club. A majority of the comments came from Nebraska and South Dakota and suggested attention be given to increased recreational opportunities within the unit, increased protection of the Missouri River's natural landscape, that additional river banks be stabilized, that the "local voice" be heeded in management actions, and expressed concern over perceived loss of landowner rights. Responses to these and other questions were provided in the final EIS.

In October 1999 the Final GMP/EIS was printed and distributed to more than 170 federal, state, tribal, and local officials, public repositories in the project area, and to individuals providing written comments. A thirty-day review period closed on November 15, 1999. In the document the NPS and COE affirmed a preferred alternative and boundary. During the closing review

two responses were received, including one from a correspondent whose letter received during the sixty-day public review period was not printed in the final GMP/EIS as it pertained wholly to issues on a separate Missouri River reach; and from Representative Doug Bereuter of Nebraska's First Congressional District, who particularly sought clarification on the matter of cost sharing in project management. While cost sharing is a legislative requirement in most COE projects, and while the NPS endorses the cost share concept because it engenders broad support for projects, NPS does not mandate cost sharing for its projects.

#### Selection of the Preferred Alternative

Alternatives two and three for management of the Missouri National Recreational River were considered equally acceptable from an environmental standpoint. The Preferred Alternative is selected because it is considered the most effective alternative for protecting river values and maintaining existing economic uses along the river consistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the 1978 amending act. The selected alternative is not expected to have any significant effects on natural or cultural values within the designated boundaries. The selected Boundary is preferable environmentally, and is chosen for that reason.

Dated: December 17, 1999.

**William W. Schenk,**

*Regional Director, Midwest Region, National Park Service.*

Dated: December 17, 1999.

**Mark E. Tillotson,**

*Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer.*

[FR Doc. 99-33447 Filed 12-23-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-70-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

##### National Park Service

#### Agenda for the February 2, 2000 Public Meeting of the Advisory Commission for the San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park

##### Public Meeting; Fort Mason Building F (Firehouse), 10:00 AM-12:00 PM

10:00 a.m.

Welcome—Neil Chaitin, Chairman  
Opening Remarks—Neil Chaitin,  
Chairman

Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting

10:15 a.m.

Update—Haslett Warehouse, William Thomas, Superintendent

10:30 a.m.

##### STAFF REPORTS

Ships, Wayne Boykin  
Operations, Marc Hayman  
Collections, Tom Mulhern  
National Maritime Museum  
Association, Kathy Lohan

11:30 a.m.

Public Comments and Questions

11:45 a.m.

Election of Officers

12:00 p.m.

Agenda items/Date for next meeting

**William Thomas,**

*Superintendent.*

[FR Doc. 99-33507 Filed 12-23-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-70-M**

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

##### Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

##### Watershed Cooperative Agreement Program

**AGENCY:** Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of funds for the Watershed Cooperative Agreement Program.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) of the U.S. Department of the Interior is announcing its intent to solicit applications from eligible, not-for-profit candidates for funding under the Watershed Cooperative Agreement Program to undertake local acid mine drainage reclamation projects.

**DATES:** Applications for the cooperative agreements should be submitted to the appropriate individual listed under **ADDRESSES AND FURTHER INFORMATION** starting December 27, 1999.

Applications will be accepted until June 1, 2000, or until all available funds have been awarded, whichever is sooner.

##### **ADDRESSES AND FURTHER INFORMATION:**

Requests for an application package, which includes further information on the program, the application forms and evaluation criteria, should be directed to the appropriate Appalachian Clean Streams Coordinator: *Alabama:* Jeannie O'Dell, Birmingham Field Office, 135 Gemini Circle, Suite 215, Homewood, AL 35209, Telephone 205-290-7282, ext. 21; *Illinois:* Ken Foit, Indianapolis Field Office, Minton-Capehart Federal Building, 575 N. Pennsylvania Street, Room 392, Indianapolis, IN 46204, Telephone 317-226-6166 ext 230; *Indiana:* Michael Kalagian, Indianapolis Field Office, Minton-Capehart Federal Building, 575 N. Pennsylvania Street, Room 392, Indianapolis, IN 46204,

Telephone 317-226-6166 ext 234; *Iowa*: Stephen Preston, Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center, Alton Federal Center, 501 Belle Street, Room 216, Alton, IL 62002, Telephone 618-463-6463 ext 120; *Kentucky*: Dave Beam, Lexington Field Office, 2675 Regency Road, Lexington, KY 40503, Telephone 606-233-2896; *Maryland*: Peter Hartman, Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center, 3 Parkway Center, Pittsburgh, PA 15220; Telephone 412-937-2905; *Missouri*: Jeff Gillespie, Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center, Alton Federal Center, 501 Belle Street, Room 216, Alton, IL 62002, Telephone 618-463-6463 ext 128; *Ohio*: Max Luehrs, Columbus Area Office, 4480 Refugee Road, Suite 201, Columbus, OH 43232, Telephone 614-866-0578 ext. 110; *Oklahoma*: Daniel Trout, Tulsa Field Office, 5100 East Skelly Drive S-550, Tulsa, OK 74135, Telephone 918-581-6430 ext 25; *Pennsylvania*: David Hamilton, Harrisburg Field Office, 415 Market Street, Suite 3, Harrisburg, PA 17101, Telephone 717-782-2285; *Tennessee*: Danny Ellis, Knoxville Field Office, 530 Gay Street, Suite 500, Knoxville, TN 37902, Telephone 423-545-4103 ext 147; *Virginia*: Ronnie Vicars, Big Stone Gap Field Office, 1941 Neeley Road, Suite 201, Compartment 116, Big Stone Gap, VA 24219, Telephone 540-523-5053; *West Virginia*: Rick Buckley, Charleston Field Office, 1027 Virginia Street East Charleston, WV 25301, Telephone 304-347-7162 ext 3024.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For Fiscal year 2000, OSM expects to award up to 1.75 million dollars to eligible not-for-profit groups to undertake actual construction projects to clean up streams impacted by acid mine drainage. The cooperative agreements will be in the \$5,000-\$80,000 range in order to assist as many groups as possible. The cooperative agreements will have a performance period of two years.

Eligible applicants are not-for-profit, established organizations with IRS 501(c)(3) status. Applicants must have other partners, contributing either funding or in-kind services; the partners must provide a substantial portion of the total resources needed to complete the project.

Projects in the following States are eligible: Alabama, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia. Projects must meet eligibility criteria for coal projects outlined in Section 404 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977:

Lands and water eligible for reclamation or drainage abatement expenditures under this title are those which were mined for coal or which were affected by such mining, wastebanks, coal processing, or other coal mining processes \* \* \* and abandoned or left in an inadequate reclamation status prior to the date of enactment of this Act [August 3, 1977], and for which there is no continuing reclamation responsibility under State or other Federal laws.

There must be demonstrated public support for the project. The project should propose to use proven or innovative technology that has a high probability of success. The project must produce tangible results, e.g., fishery restored, stream miles improved, educational and community benefits, pollutants removed from the streams. The funds must be used primarily for the construction phase of a project; reimbursement of administrative costs will be carefully scrutinized. There must be a plan to address any ongoing operation/maintenance considerations.

Two copies of a complete application should be submitted to the appropriate Appalachian Clean Streams Coordinator identified under **ADDRESSES AND FURTHER INFORMATION**. Awards are subject to the availability of funds. Applications will receive technical and financial management reviews.

Dated: December 17, 1999.

**Kathy Karpan,**

*Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 99-33463 Filed 12-23-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-05-M**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 332-288]

### Ethyl Alcohol for Fuel Use: Determination of the Base Quantity of Imports

**AGENCY:** United States International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of Determination.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 20, 1999.

**SUMMARY:** Section 7 of the Steel Trade Liberalization Program Implementation Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2703 note), which concerns local feedstock requirements for fuel ethyl alcohol imported by the United States from CBI-beneficiary countries, requires the Commission to determine annually the U.S. domestic market for fuel ethyl alcohol during the 12-month period ending on the preceding September 30. The domestic market determination made by the Commission is to be used

to establish the "base quantity" of imports that can be imported with a zero percent local feedstock requirement. The base quantity to be used by the U.S. Customs Service in the administration of the law is the greater of 60 million gallons or 7 percent of U.S. consumption as determined by the Commission. Beyond the base quantity of imports, progressively higher local feedstock requirements are placed on imports of fuel ethyl alcohol and mixtures from the CBI-beneficiary countries.

For the 12-month period ending September 30, 1999, the Commission has determined the level of U.S. consumption of fuel ethyl alcohol to be 1.32 billion gallons. Seven percent of this amount is 92.3 million gallons (these figures have been rounded). Therefore, the base quantity for 2000 should be 92.3 million gallons.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Devry Boughner (202) 205-3313 in the Commission's Office of Industries. For information on legal aspects of the investigation contact Mr. William Gearhart of the Commission's Office of the General Counsel at (202) 205-3091. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting our TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

#### Background

For purposes of making determinations of the U.S. market for fuel ethyl alcohol as required by section 7 of the Act, the Commission instituted Investigation No. 332-288, Ethyl Alcohol for Fuel Use: Determination of the Base Quantity of Imports, in March 1990. The Commission uses official statistics of the U.S. Department of Energy to make these determinations as well as the PIERS database of the Journal of Commerce, which is based on U.S. export declarations. Section 225 of the Customs and Trade Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-382, August 20, 1990) amended the original language set forth in the Steel Trade Liberalization Program Implementation Act of 1989. The amendment requires the Commission to make a determination of the U.S. domestic market for fuel ethyl alcohol for each year after 1989.

Issued: December 21, 1999.

By order of the Commission.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-33478 Filed 12-23-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**