

and specific concerns already raised during previous relevant planning processes were provided to the public. Over a five-year period a series of public scoping and public informational meetings were held. Public scoping comments were received through this entire process. During this scoping period, the NPS facilitated over 100 discussions and briefings to interested members of the public, congressional delegations, Indian tribes, elected officials, other agencies, public service organizations, educational institutions, and other entities. Over 1,000 letters were received concerning the management of recreational use of the waters of Lake Mead NRA.

The Lake Management Plan/DEIS—formally announced for public review per notice of availability published in the **Federal Register** on April 19, 2002—was sent directly to all individuals, organizations, and agencies which had previously contacted the park; copies could also be obtained in the park, by mail, at public meetings, and were available for review at local and regional libraries (*i.e.*, Las Vegas, Henderson, Boulder City, Laughlin, Bullhead City, Kingman, Overton, Mesquite and St. George). Additional copies were sent to public libraries in Southern California including Needles, San Bernardino, Victorville, Barstow, Irvine, Long Beach, Northridge and Los Angeles. Finally, the complete document was posted on the Lake Mead National Recreation Area Webpage (<http://www.nps.gov/lame/planning>). Written comments were accepted through June 26, 2002. Approximately 10,000 comments were received; of these 6,000 were electronic form letters and 1,000 were printed post cards; all were duly considered and adjustments were made to the draft plan. The issues focused on boating access, zoning, carrying capacity, shoreline wakeless zones and personal watercraft use. All written comments have been logged, archived and are available for public review in the park's research library.

In order to further foster public review and comment, six public meetings were held throughout the region—all were conducted in communities, cities and towns neighboring Lake Mead National Recreation Area. All meetings were conducted in an open house format (where participants could view displays and talk with park management and planning staff). At each of these meetings, written comment forms could be submitted or oral testimony was documented by a court reporter. Approximately 750 persons attended these meetings and the majority

submitted written or oral comments. In addition, presentations were made before the Laughlin Town Board and the Searchlight Town Board.

Decision Process: Subsequent to release of the Lake Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement, notice of an approved record of decision shall be published in the **Federal Register** not sooner than 30 days after the final document has been distributed. This is expected to occur by the end of December 2002. The official responsible for the decision is the Regional Director, Pacific West Region, National Park Service; the official responsible for implementation is the Superintendent, Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

Dated: November 25, 2002.

Jonathan B. Jarvis,

Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

[FR Doc. 03-118 Filed 1-9-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-03-001]

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:

International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: January 27, 2003 at 11 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205-2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agenda for future meetings: none.
2. Minutes.
3. Ratification List.
4. Inv. No. TA-421-2 (Market Disruption)(Certain Steel Wire Garment Hangers from China)—briefing and vote. (The Commission is currently scheduled to transmit its determination on market disruption to the President on January 27, 2003.)
5. Outstanding action jackets: none.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

Issued: January 8, 2003.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 03-659 Filed 1-8-03; 3:00 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States of America v. Mountain Health Care Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 16(b) through (h), that a proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed in a civil antitrust case, *United States of America v. Mountain Health Care*, Civil Action No. 1:02CV288-T, in the United States District Court for the District of Western North Carolina. The Complaint alleges that Mountain Health Care ("MHC") and its participating physicians developed a uniform fee schedule and used that fee schedule in negotiations with managed care purchasers in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. In order to restore competition, the proposed Final Judgment requires that MHC be dissolved. Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection at the Department of Justice in Washington, DC in Room 200, 325 7th Street, NW., and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Western North Carolina. The documents may also be found on the Antitrust Division's Web site, *lte://www.usdoj.gov/atr*.

Public comment on the proposed Final Judgment is invited within the statutory 60-day comment period. Such comments and responses thereto will be published in the **Federal Register** and filed with the Court. Comments should be directed to Mark J. Botti, Chief; Litigation I; Antitrust Division; United States Department of Justice; 1401 H Street., NW.; Room 4000; Washington, DC 20530 (Tel.: (202) 307-0001).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations.

Stipulation

It is stipulated by and between the undersigned parties, by their respective attorneys, that:

1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and over each of the parties hereto, and venue of this action is proper in the Western District of North Carolina.

2. The parties consent that a Final Judgment in the form hereto attached may be filed and entered by the Court, upon the motion of any party or upon the Court's own motion, at any time after compliance with the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act (15 U.S.C. 16), and without further notice to any party or other proceedings, provided that plaintiff has not