

directed to John Knaus at (703) 305-2098.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Use of Public Comments

Your comments, in their entirety or summarized, may be posted on our Web site. If you wish to request that we withhold your name, street address, or other contact information from public review or from Web posting, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. We will honor requests for confidentiality on a case-by-case basis to the extent allowed by law.

Discussion

The Department and many stakeholders involved with the FSP believe that the Program's name is outdated and reflects neither the current benefit delivery technology nor the mission of the nation's primary and largest nutrition assistance program. One of the common themes heard during nationwide "listening sessions" conducted by the Department in preparation for the Program's Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 reauthorization was that the FSP should be renamed to reflect its operation and purpose. Although the FSP continues to serve as the cornerstone of the national nutrition safety net to reduce hunger and improve nutrition and health among low-income people, the use of actual "stamps" to issue benefits ended decades ago. The FSP currently reaches over 23 million Americans each month. Unlike most other assistance programs, the FSP is available to most low-income households with few resources wherever they live regardless of age, disability status or family structure. In FY 2002, over two thirds of all FSP participants were either children, elderly or disabled individuals. Even so, more food stamp households relied on work (28 percent) to make ends meet than on cash welfare (21 percent). Nearly 30 percent of households received Supplemental Security Income and almost one quarter (24 percent) received Social Security benefits.

Over the years, the FSP has demonstrated its responsiveness to economic changes, expanding to meet increased need when the economy slows and contracting when the economy grows, making sure that food gets to people when they need it most. Because benefits automatically flow into communities, the economic gain is not only to low-income families, but also to the community at large. Every \$5 in Federal food stamps issued generates an average of \$9.20 in local and State economic activity.

The FSP delivers billions of dollars in benefits with a high degree of accuracy and accountability. Since 1974, FNS has used a statistical sampling system called the Quality Control system to annually measure payment accuracy or the amount of overpayments (too many benefits issued) and underpayments (too few benefits issued). Based on FY 2002 data from this system, 98 percent of all participating households are entitled to receive benefits and almost 94 cents of every food stamp dollar was issued correctly.

In spite of the FSP's many recent accomplishments, its name remains linked to the original program that was operating in 1939 when benefits were issued to individuals on welfare in the form of orange and blue stamps. That program ended four years later when wartime conditions reduced the nation's widespread unemployment. From the time a pilot FSP was reinstated in 1961, and made permanent in 1964, food stamp benefits were issued to recipients in the form of paper coupons. Today, with advancements in modern technology, paper coupons have been replaced by electronic issuances through an EBT system.

In addition to the name being outdated in describing the method by which benefits are issued, the FSP is not widely recognized by recipients and the general public as a nutrition assistance program with a focus on fighting hunger and improving nutrition and health among low-income people. Some State program administrators and advocacy groups have expressed that this misunderstanding creates a barrier to participation and is a reason why nationwide only 3 of 5 persons eligible for the Program are participating. Concerned about the misperception, some State agencies have already renamed the FSP within their States. For example, in Washington State, the FSP is now called the "Washington Basic Food Program" or "Basic Food". The Michigan Family Independence Agency and the Minnesota Department of Human Services have renamed the FSPs in those States the "Food Assistance Program" and the "Food Support Program," respectively. Although these names are descriptive of the services provided, the Department believes that a national program should have a name that is recognized across States to promote a consistent message about the FSP's mission of providing nutritional assistance and promoting health.

The Department also believes that any name change should be descriptive while reflecting the purposes of the Program to: provide nutrition or food

assistance; ensure availability to all who are eligible; and promote a healthy diet. To this point, it appears that most people support changing the Program's current name. However, it has been difficult to reach a consensus on a specific alternative. Some suggestions for a new Program name that we have heard include the "National Food Assistance Program" (NFAP), the "Food Security Program" (FSP), the "Nutrition Support Program" (NSP), the "Food Support Program" (FSP), and the "Food and Nutrition Program" (FNP). While a new name for the Program is not limited to these suggestions, we encourage commenters to consider these names.

To help us in making a decision about the possible renaming of the FSP, the Department is requesting responses to the following questions.

- (1) Should the FSP be renamed?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If so, do you have a name you would propose or recommend?
- (4) How does the name change reflect the purpose of the program?

Once we have compiled the results, the Department will post a summary of the responses on its Web site at <http://www.fns.usda.gov/fns/>. If the Department decides to proceed with a name change, we will work with the appropriate Congressional committees to pursue the required legislative changes. Any final decision on whether the FSP should be renamed and, if so, what its new name should be, rests with the Congress.

Dated: June 7, 2004.

Eric M. Bost,

Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.

[FR Doc. 04-13761 Filed 6-21-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign Agricultural Service

WTO Agricultural Safeguard Trigger Levels

AGENCY: Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of product coverage and trigger levels for safeguard measures provided for in the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on Agriculture.

SUMMARY: This notice lists the updated quantity trigger levels for products, which may be subject to additional import duties under the safeguard provisions of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture. It also includes the relevant

period applicable for trigger levels on each of those products.

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 22, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles R. Bertsch, Multilateral Trade Negotiations Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, room 5524—South Building, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250–1022, telephone at (202) 720–6278, or e-mail *charles.bertsch@usda.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Article 5 of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture provides that additional import duties may be imposed on imports of products subject to tariffication as a result of the Uruguay Round if certain conditions are met. The agreement permits additional duties to be charged if the price of an individual shipment of imported products falls below the average price for similar goods imported during the years 1986–88 by a specified percentage. It also permits additional duties to be imposed if the volume of imports of an article exceeds the average of the most recent 3 years for which data are

available by 5, 10, or 25 percent, depending on the article. These additional duties may not be imposed on quantities for which minimum or current access commitments were made during the Uruguay Round negotiations, and only one type of safeguard, price or quantity, may be applied at any given time to an article.

Section 405 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act requires that the President cause to be published in the **Federal Register** information regarding the price and quantity safeguards, including the quantity trigger levels, which must be updated annually based upon import levels during the most recent 3 years. The President delegated this duty to the Secretary of Agriculture in Presidential Proclamation No. 6763, *Quantity Based Safeguard Trigger* dated December 23, 1994. The Secretary of Agriculture further delegated the duty to the Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service (7 CFR 2.43 (a)(2)). The Annex to this notice contains the updated quantity trigger levels.

Additional information on the products subject to safeguards and the additional duties which may apply can be found in subchapter IV of Chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and in the Secretary of Agriculture’s Notice of Safeguard Action, published in the **Federal Register** at 60 FR 427, January 4, 1995.

Notice: As provided in section 405 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, consistent with Article 5 of the Agreement on Agriculture, the safeguard quantity trigger levels previously notified are superseded by the levels indicated in the Annex to this notice.

Issued at Washington, DC, this 14th day of June, 2004.

A. Ellen Terpstra,
Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Annex.

The definitions of these products were provided in the Notice of Safeguard Action published in the **Federal Register**, at 60 FR 427, January 4, 1995.

QUANTITY-BASED SAFEGUARD TRIGGER

Product	Trigger level	Period
Beef	1,193,903 mt	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Mutton	20,668 mt	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Cream	5,839,930 liters	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Evaporated or Condensed Milk	7,019,525 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Nonfat Dry Milk	3,677,993 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Dried Whole Milk	4,116,442 kilograms	January 1, 2004. to December 31, 2004
Dried Cream	40,845 kilograms	January 1, 2004. to December 31, 2004
Dried Whey/Buttermilk	90,263 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Butter	13,754,490 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Butter Oil and Butter Substitutes	10,516,706 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Dairy Mixtures	5,131,250 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Blue Cheese	4,561,399 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Cheddar Cheese	16,309,700 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
American-Type Cheese	25,288,825 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Edam/Gouda Cheese	8,242,960 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Italian-Type Cheese	20,435,015 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Swiss Cheese with Eye Formation	35,995,675 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Gruyere Process Cheese	8,309,266 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Lowfat Cheese	3,598,612 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
NSPF Cheese	59,837,314 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Peanuts	54,853 mt	April 1, 2004 to March 31, 2005.
Peanut Butter/Paste	20,512 mt	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Raw Cane Sugar	1,267,407 mt	October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.
	1,297,851 mt	October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005.
Refined Sugar and Syrups	95,196 mt	October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.
	95,785 mt	October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005.
Blended Syrups	5 mt	October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.
	8 mt	October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005.
Articles Over 65% Sugar	23 mt	October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.
	23 mt	October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005.
Articles Over 10% Sugar	80,886 mt	October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.
	80,886 mt	October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005.
Sweetened Cocoa Powder	841 mt	October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.
	531 mt	October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005.
Chocolate Crumb	25,555,455 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2005.
Lowfat Chocolate Crumb	460,840 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Infant Formula Containing Oligosaccharides	106,234 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Mixes and Doughs	5,375 mt	October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.
	6,757 mt	October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005.

QUANTITY-BASED SAFEGUARD TRIGGER—Continued

Product	Trigger level	Period
Mixed Condiments and Seasonings	560 mt	October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.
	402 mt	October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005.
Ice Cream	4,404,744 liters	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Animal Feed Containing Milk	28,962 kilograms	January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004.
Short Staple Cotton	233,399 kilograms	September 20, 2003 to September 19, 2004.
	94,717 kilograms	September 20, 2004 to September 19, 2005.
Harsh or Rough Cotton	0 mt	August 1, 2003 to July 31, 2004.
	0 mt	August 1, 2004 to July 31, 2005.
Medium Staple Cotton	483,797 kilograms	August 1, 2003 to July 31, 2004.
	485,971 kilograms	August 1, 2004 to July 31, 2005.
Extra Long Staple Cotton	7,231,773 kilograms	August 1, 2003 to July 31, 2004.
	8,982,620 kilograms	August 1, 2004 to July 31, 2005.
Cotton Waste	0 kilograms	September 20, 2003 to September 19, 2004.
	0 kilograms	September 20, 2004 to September 19, 2005.
Cotton, Processed, Not Spun	2,083 kilograms	September 11, 2003 to September 10, 2004.
	5,343 kilograms	September 11, 2004 to September 10, 2005.

[FR Doc. 04-14064 Filed 6-21-04; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 3410-10-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Black Hills National Forest, Mystic Ranger District, South Dakota, Deerfield Project Area Proposal and Analysis

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement on a proposal for multiple resource management actions within the Deerfield Project Area to implement the Black Hills National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. The Deerfield Project Area covers about 41,000 acres of National Forest System land and about 5,200 acres of interspersed private land approximately 11 miles northwest of Hill City, South Dakota. The proposed action is to conduct vegetation management within the project area consisting of both commercial and non-commercial removal of trees, reduction of existing fuels and created activity fuels, and prescribed burning. Specific actions proposed for the Deerfield Project Area include the following: Commercial timber harvest of trees 7 inches or greater in diameter to thin stand densities, lower the potential for large scale mountain pine beetle infestations and crown fires, to create a mosaic of tree sizes and age classes, and to remove pine encroachment from meadows and hardwoods. These treatments would occur on approximately 14,000 acres. Non-commercial removal of trees smaller than 7 inches in diameter to

reduce stand densities, eliminate ladder fuels, and improve the health and vigor of remaining trees would occur on approximately 4,200 acres, most of which overlap with commercial timber harvest acres. Forest fuels that currently exist and those created by harvest and thinning activities would be reduced by actions such as lopping, chipping, crushing, or piling and burning. Fuel breaks approximately 200 to 300 feet wide would be constructed adjacent to private land to provide some measure of protection to private land or structures in the event of a wildfire. These fuel breaks would consist of thinning existing trees of all sizes on approximately 1,400 acres. Some of these acres may overlap with other commercial and non-commercial treatments described above. Prescribed burning would be conducted on approximately 7,000 to 10,000 acres to reduce the continuity and amount of fuels, reduce the potential for large scale crown fires, and restore fire to its natural ecological role. Many of these acres will overlap with the vegetation treatments already described.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope of the analysis would be most useful if received by 30-days following the date of this notice. Comments submitted by individuals and groups during the initial May 2004 scoping period have been incorporated and there is no need to resubmit comments in response to this NOI. The draft environmental impact statement is expected to be available for public review by November 2004 and the final environmental impact statement is expected to be completed by February 2004.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Robert J. Thompson, District Ranger, Black Hills National Forest, Mystic Ranger District, Deerfield Project Area,

800 Soo San Drive, Rapid City, South Dakota 57702. Telephone Number: (605) 343-1567. E-mail: *comments-rocky-mountain-black-hills-mystic@fs.fed.us* with "Deerfield" as the subject. Electronic comments must be readable in Word, RichText or pdf formats.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Katie Van Alstyne, Project Coordinator, Black Hills National Forest, Mystic Ranger District, at above address, phone (605) 343-1567.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The actions proposed are in direct response to management direction provided by the Black Hills National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan). The site specific actions are designed based on Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines to move existing resource conditions in the Deerfield Project Area toward meeting Forest Plan Goals and Objectives. The project areas includes the Deerfield Recreation Area with Deerfield Lake, Reynolds Prairie, and Hat and Flag Mountains and lies approximately 11 miles northwest of Hill City, South Dakota. Anticipated issues include: an increasing mountain pine beetle (MPB) infestation and pine tree mortality; fire and fuels hazard reduction; support and opposition to vegetation treatment such as timber harvest; impacts of vegetation treatment and multiple forest uses on wildlife habitat.

Purpose and Need for Action

The purpose of and need for the actions proposed in the Deerfield Project is to: Reduce the potential for large scale MPB infestations, to break up the continuity of dense timber stands, reduce the potential for large scale wildfire, and restore hardwoods and meadows. This project will address Goals 2 and 3 of the Forest Plan—to provide for biologically diverse