interpretation would be promoted by providing programs and partnerships with local schools. Wildlife observation and photography opportunities would be expanded, including construction of photo blinds and observation towers. Information guides and signage that highlight refuge management programs, as well as unique wildlife habitats, would also be developed. The refuge would also undertake efforts to improve road maintenance in order to provide better visitor access.

A visitor center and headquarters office would be constructed on the refuge, with space for interpretation, environmental education, and staff.

Research studies on the refuge would continue to be fostered and partnerships developed with universities and other agencies, with the refuge providing needed resources and study sites. Research on the refuge would also provide benefits to conservation efforts throughout the Lower Mississippi River Valley to preserve, enhance, restore, and manage bottomland hardwood habitat. Inventorying and monitoring of birds, freshwater mussels, reptiles, and amphibians would be continued and expanded in order to assess population trends, correlate with environmental pressures, and provide baseline data to be used in development of appropriate management strategies.

Providing additional staff (e.g., wildlife biologist, biological technician, outdoor recreation planner, seasonal maintenance worker, and full-time law enforcement officer) would enable the Service to fully develop and manage fish and wildlife resources and habitats, an offer environmental educational programs that promote a greater understanding of both natural and cultural resources.

Under this alternative, the refuge would continue to acquire lands within the present acquisition boundary for compatible wildlife-dependent public recreation and environmental education opportunities.

Tracts that provide better-quality habitat and connectivity to existing refuge lands would receive higher priority for acquisition. The refuge would use other important acquisition tools, including land exchanges, partnerships with conservation organizations, conservation easements with adjacent landowners, and leases/ cooperative agreements.

Authority: This notice is published under the authority of the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, Public Law 105–57. Dated: April 29, 2005. **Cynthia K. Dohner,** *Acting Regional Director.* 

Editorial Note: This document was received at the Office of the Federal Register October 31, 2005. [FR Doc. 05–21906 Filed 11–2–05; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4310–55–M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

# General Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Colorado National Monument, Colorado

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior. ACTION: Notice of Availability of a Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the General Management Plan, Colorado National Monument.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 83 Stat. 852, 853, codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the National Park Service announces the availability of the Record of Decision for the General Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Colorado National Monument, Colorado. On August 31, 2005, the Director, Intermountain Region, approved the Record of Decision for the project. As soon as practicable, the National Park Service will begin to implement the Preferred Alternative contained in the FEIS issued on June 6. 2005. The following course of action will occur under the preferred alternative: Weave Colorado National Monument into the regional ecosystem on the northeastern edge of the Colorado Plateau by pursuing common stewardship goals with government agencies, tribes, educational institutions, and communities.

This course of action and 2 alternatives were analyzed in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. The full range of foreseeable environmental consequences was assessed, and appropriate mitigating measures were identified.

The Record of Decision includes a statement of the decision made, synopses of other alternatives considered, the basis for the decision, a description of the environmentally preferable alternative, a finding on impairment of park resources and values, a listing of measures to minimize environmental harm, an overview of public involvement in the decision-making process, and finding that the alternative selected for implementation will not impair park resources or values and will not violate the NPS Organic Act.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent Bruce Noble, Colorado National Monument, Fruita, CO 81521– 0001; Tel: (970) 858–3617, ext. 300; FAX: (970) 858–0372; e-mail: *bruce\_noble@nps.gov.* 

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Copies of the Record of Decision may be obtained from the contact listed above or online at *http://planning.nps.gov/plans.cfm* 

Dated: August 30, 2005.

#### Michael D. Snyder,

Acting Director, Intermountain Region, National Park Service. [FR Doc. 05–21941 Filed 11–2–05; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4312–CP–P

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 731–TA–308–310, 520, and 521 (Second Review)]

# Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Brazil, China, Japan, Taiwan, and Thailand

# **Determinations**

On the basis of the record <sup>1</sup> developed in these subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines,<sup>2</sup> pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act), that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Brazil, China, Japan, Taiwan, and Thailand would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

# Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on December 1, 2004 (69 FR 69952) and determined on March 7, 2005 that it would conduct full reviews (70 FR 14713, March 23, 2005). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's reviews 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

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Commissioner Shara L. Aranoff did not participate in these reviews.

notice in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 2005 (70 FR 24838). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on September 7, 2005, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these reviews to the Secretary of Commerce on October 31, 2005. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3809 (October 2005), entitled *Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Brazil, China, Japan, Taiwan, and Thailand: Investigation Nos. 731–TA–308–310, 520, and 521 (Second Review).* 

By order of the Commission. Issued: October 31, 2005.

#### Marilyn R. Abbott,

*Secretary to the Commission.* [FR Doc. 05–21948 Filed 11–2–05; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 701–TA–431 (Section 129 Consistency Determination)]

# DRAMs and DRAM Modules from Korea

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

**ACTION:** Institution of a proceeding under section 129(a)(4) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) (19 U.S.C. 3538(a)(4)).

**SUMMARY:** The Commission hereby gives notice that it has instituted this proceeding following receipt on October 14, 2005, of a request from the United States Trade Representative (USTR) for a determination under section 129(a)(4) of the URAA that would render the Commission's action in connection with Investigation No. 701-TA-431 not inconsistent with the findings of the dispute settlement panel of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in its report United States—Countervailing Duty Investigation on Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors (DRAMs) from Korea, WT/DS296/R. For further information concerning the conduct of this proceeding 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, subpart A (19 CFR part 207). DATES: Effective Date November 3, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert Carpenter (202–205–3160), Office of Investigations, or Marc A. Bernstein (202–205–3087), Office of General Counsel, U.S. International

Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearingimpaired 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). The public record of Investigation No. 701–TA–431 may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at http://edis.usitc.gov.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background. In August 2003, the Commission determined that an industry in the United States was materially injured by reason of subsidized imports of DRAMs and DRAM modules from Korea. Countervailing duties were then assessed against these products. The Republic of Korea subsequently initiated a dispute settlement proceeding at the WTO concerning the U.S. countervailing duty measure. Korea's action challenged both the Department of Commerce's subsidy determination and the Commission's injury determination.

The WTO dispute resolution panel issued its report on December 21, 2004. The panel evaluated six principal claims that Korea raised against the Commission's injury determination. It ruled in favor of the United States on five of these claims. The sixth claim concerned whether the Commission properly complied with the obligation under Article 15.5 of the WTO Agreement of Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (ASCM) not to attribute to the subject imports injury caused by other factors. The panel concluded that the Commission successfully satisfied the nonattribution obligation with respect to the factors of non-subject imports; capacity increases by DRAMs suppliers other than Hynix, the sole producer of subject merchandise; and the purported technological and production difficulties of U.S. producer Micron. It also concluded, however, that the Commission did not successfully satisfy the non-attribution obligation with respect to the factor of declines in demand. Thus, in this one respect, the Panel concluded that the Commission's determination was inconsistent with the ASCM. The pertinent discussion appears at paragraphs 7.356-7.371 of the Panel Report.

Neither the United States nor Korea appealed the aspects of the Panel Report that addressed the Commission injury determination to the WTO Appellate Body. Both countries did appeal other aspects of the Panel Report, principally concerning Commerce's subsidy determination. On June 27, 2005, the Appellate Body resolved the issues on appeal in favor of the United States.

On July 20, 2005, the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) adopted the Panel Report as modified by the Appellate Body. Consequently, the DSB's action finalized the panel's conclusions concerning the Commission's determination. On August 3, 2005, the United States informed the DSB that it intends within a reasonable period of time to bring its measure into conformity with the report that the DSB had adopted.

The USTR transmitted his request for this determination following receipt from the Commission on September 22, 2005, of an advisory report under section 129(a)(1) of the URAA stating that the Commission has concluded that Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 permits it to take steps in connection with its action in *DRAMs and DRAM Modules from Korea*, Investigation No. 701–TA–431, that would render its action in that proceeding not inconsistent with the findings of the dispute settlement panel.

Participation in the investigation and public service list. Only those persons who were interested parties to the original investigation (*i.e.*, persons listed on the Commission Secretary's service list) may participate in this proceeding. Such persons wishing to participate in this proceeding as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in section 201.11 of the Commission's rules, no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register. The Secretary will maintain a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to this proceeding.

Limited disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI) under an administrative protective order (APO) and APO service list. Pursuant to section 207.7(a) of the Commission's rules, the Secretary will make business proprietary information (BPI) gathered in the original investigation available under administrative protective order (APO) to authorized applicants that returned or destroyed all BPI received under the APO in the original investigation or were not covered under the original APO, provided that an application is made in this proceeding.