

that input the planning team developed a preliminary preferred alternative, which was presented in Newsletter #6 in July 1997.

The Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was produced and distributed for public review in March 1998. Public meetings were held in April 1998 at St. Paul and Duluth, Minnesota, and Houghton and Ann Arbor, Michigan. Approximately 75–150 people attended each of the meetings. Additionally, nearly 600 responses were received by mail or on the Internet. The preferred alternative was subsequently revised and the Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was distributed in November 1998.

Sixteen (16) letters commenting on the GMP/FEIS were received. There were few new ideas expressed in the letters; similar comments (with NPS responses) were incorporated into the GMP/FEIS. Concerns related to the following general topic areas were expressed: separation of uses (including concerns about non-motorized zones), concessions services at Rock Harbor (including concerns about affordability and accessibility of overnight accommodations), and dock removal and replacement. The National Park Service has heard these concerns, and responded to them in the "Summary of Public Comments" section of the GMP/FEIS.

### Conclusion

A notice of availability for the Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for Isle Royale National Park was published in the **Federal Register** on November 3, 1998, and the 30-day no-action period ended on December 3, 1998.

The above factors and considerations justify the selection of the final plan, as described in the "Proposed Action" section of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The final general management plan is hereby approved.

Dated: May 21, 1999.

**William W. Schenk,**

*Regional Director.*

[FR Doc. 99-14440 Filed 6-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### **New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park, New Orleans, Louisiana; Notice of Availability of Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park**

**SUMMARY:** This Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement describes and analyzes three alternatives proposed by the National Park Service for setting park management and direction for New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park over the next 10 to 15 years. The format of the document will be as an abbreviated final environmental impact statement. **Alternative A** is the no-action, or status quo, alternative. This alternative would not allow the park to achieve its mission; however, it does provide a baseline for comparison with the other alternatives. **Alternative B** would emphasize conveying the park's interpretive story through such personal programs as interpreted performances, seminars, and performances. Educational activities would be given maximum emphasis in this alternative. It would allow the park to assist in the adaptive use of structures related to jazz. Interpretive programming would heavily depend on the involvement of local musicians and educators, thus supporting cultural preservation. Under this alternative, the visitor center would be located at the Old U.S. Mint. **Alternative C** would emphasize a strong partnership program between the National Park Service and other entities involved in preserving the New Orleans jazz tradition. In Alternative C, the National Park Service would provide funding for basic park operations and would work intensively with others to develop partnerships and alternative funding sources for interpretation, visitor use and experiences, and other activities focusing on preserving the jazz tradition. The extent and success of this alternative would depend on substantial support from partners, especially the private sector. Interpretation media would be extensively used, and the size and scope of park educational and preservation programs would be guided by the development of partnerships. Under this alternative, the visitor center would be located at a complex in Louis Armstrong Park. Alternative C is the National Park Service's **Proposed Action**.

Environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the alternatives are addressed in the

document. Impact topics include cultural and natural resources, interpretation and visitor use, socioeconomic environment, and National Park Service operations. Measures that would be taken to mitigate impacts are also described in the document.

**Availability:** The Final Environmental Impact Statement is being mailed to agencies, organizations, and individuals on the park's mailing list, and a limited number of copies will be available at park headquarters at the following address: Superintendent, New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park, 365 Canal Street, Suite 2400, New Orleans, LA 70130, Telephone (504) 589-4806.

No sooner than 30 days from the appearance of this notice in the **Federal Register**, a Record of Decision will be signed that will document NPS approval of the general management plan for New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park, and identify the selected action from the alternatives presented in the FEIS.

Dated: May 28, 1999.

**W. Thomas Brown,**

*Acting Regional Director, Southeast Region.*

[FR Doc. 99-14441 Filed 6-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### **Notice of Racial Desegregation of Public Education National Historic Landmark Theme Study**

**AGENCY:** National Park Service.

**ACTION:** Notice of theme study.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that in October 1998, Congress authorized the National Park Service to prepare a National Historic Landmark (NHL) Theme Study on the history of racial desegregation in public education in the United States. The purpose of this study is to develop a historic context on the story of racial desegregation and to identify and prioritize potential National Historic Landmarks. This study will be presented to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior in October 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Sprinkle, National Register, History, and Education (2280), National Park Service, 1849 C Street, NW, Room NC-400, Washington, DC 20240. Telephone (202) 343-8166.

Dated: June 2, 1999.

**Carol D. Shull,**

*Chief, National Historic Landmarks Survey and Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, Washington Office.*

[FR Doc. 99-14451 Filed 6-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### Grand Canyon National Park, Coconino County, AZ

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

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that a proposal for a cellular communication site at Grand Canyon National Park has been received. The company proposes installing and operating a wireless telecommunications facility on the existing tower of US WEST at Grand Canyon Village of the park.

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted on or before July 5, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all written comments to Superintendent, Attn.: Barbara Nelson, Telecommunications Specialist, Grand Canyon National Park, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, AZ 86023.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sandi Perl, Management Assistant, at telephone number 520-638-7885.

Dated: June 1, 1999.

**Robert L. Arnberger,**

*Superintendent.*

[FR Doc. 99-14442 Filed 6-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-805 (Final)]

### Elastic Rubber Tape From India

#### Determination

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject investigation, the United States International Trade Commission determines, pursuant to section 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)) (the Act), that an industry in the United States is not materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of imports from India of elastic rubber tape,<sup>2</sup> classified in

subheading 4008.21.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that have been found by the Department of Commerce to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV).

#### Background

The Commission instituted this investigation effective August 18, 1998, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission and the Department of Commerce by counsel for Fulflex, Inc., Middletown, RI, and two wholly-owned subsidiaries of M-Tec Corp., Elastomer Technologies Group, Inc., Stuart, VA, and RM Engineered Products, Inc., North Charleston, SC. The final phase of the investigation was scheduled by the Commission following notification of a preliminary determination by the Department of Commerce that imports of elastic rubber tape from India were being sold at LTFV within the meaning of section 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's investigation and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** of February 10, 1999 (64 FR 6679). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on April 20, 1999, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on June 1, 1999. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3200 (June 1999), entitled Elastic Rubber Tape from India: Investigation No. 731-TA-805 (Final).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 2, 1999.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-14524 Filed 6-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-406]

### Certain Lens-Fitted Film Packages; Notice of Issuance of General Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist Orders; Termination of the Investigation

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission determined to reverse-in-part the presiding administrative law judges (ALJ's) initial determination (ID) of February 24, 1999, in the above-captioned investigation and determine that the design patents in issue are infringed by the respondents. The Commission also determined that the correct standard for the burden of proof on the repair/reconstruction issue is a preponderance of the evidence. The Commission also determined to correct certain technical errors in the ID's infringement findings. Having found a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, the Commission issued a general exclusion order and cease and desist orders directed to 20 domestic respondents, and terminated the investigation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jean Jackson, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202-205-3104. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on the matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This investigation was instituted on March 25, 1998, based on a complaint by Fuji Photo Film Co., Ltd. (Fuji) of Tokyo, Japan. 63 FR 14474. Fuji's complaint alleged unfair acts in violation of section 337 in the importation and sale of certain lens-fitted film packages (i.e., disposable cameras). The complaint alleged that 27 respondents had infringed one or more claims of 15 patents held by complainant Fuji. On October 23, 1998, the Commission determined not to review two IDs finding a total of eight respondents, viz., Boshi Technology Ltd., Fast Shot, Haichi International, Innovative Trading Company, Labelle Time, Inc., Linfa Photographic Ind. Co. Ltd., Forcemam, Inc., and Rino Trading Co. Ltd., in

<sup>1</sup> The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

<sup>2</sup> Commissioner Crawford determines that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of the subject imports from India, and

Commissioner Koplan determines that an industry in the United States is threatened with material injury by reason of the subject imports from India.