authorization was requested July 17, 1996.

The SCD boards have met regularly and provided positive leadership to the furthering of conservation and improvement of the watershed. Ongoing water quality, quantity and management practices are being installed by a combination of landowner, district and state funds. The two district boards cooperated in getting a HUA and 319 demonstration project, approved in FY–91, to show the value of surge irrigation and irrigation water management in the watershed area. The projects were enthusiastically accepted by the farmers.

In September, 1996, the watershed was approved for planning. A meeting was held in October, 1996, with field and area staffs, the State Water Resources Planning staff, and sponsors to review the Plan of Work and develop assignments to complete the watershed plan. A scoping meeting and environmental assessment meeting was held at this time.

The Watershed Plan was developed and reviewed with the sponsors at their board meetings on May 14, 1997. They requested that NRCS have a public meeting to present the plan to all interested parties. On December 3, 1997, a public meeting was held in Rocky Ford, Colorado. It was the consensus of those present to move forward into inter-agency review.

Specific consultation was conducted with the State Historic Preservation Officer concerning cultural resources in the watershed.

Public meetings were held throughout the planning process to keep all interested parties informed of the study progress and to obtain public input to the plan and environmental evaluation.

Agency consultation and public participation to date has shown no unresolved conflicts related to the project plan.

Conclusion

The Environmental Assessment summarized above indicates that this federal action will not cause significant local, regional, or national impact on the environment. Therefore, based on the above findings, I have determined that an environmental impact statement for the Highline Breaks Watershed Plan is not required.

Dated: October 28, 1998.

Stephen F. Black,

State Conservationist.

[FR Doc. 98–29379 Filed 11–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–16–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Utilities Service

Associated Electric Cooperative; Finding of No Significant Impact

AGENCY: Rural Utilities Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of Finding of No Significant Impact.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) has made a finding of no significant impact with respect to its action related to the construction of a 100 megawatt simple cycle combustion turbine electric generation plant in Southeast Missouri by Associated Electric Cooperative (Associated). The finding of no significant impact is the conclusion of an environmental assessment prepared by RUS. The environmental assessment is based on an environmental analysis submitted to RUS by Associated. RUS conducted an independent evaluation of the environmental analysis and concurs with its scope and content. The environmental analysis has been incorporated by reference in the environmental assessment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Quigel, Environmental Protection Specialist, Engineering and Environmental Staff, RUS, Stop 1571, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250, telephone (202) 720–0468, E-mail bquigel@rus.usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The preferred site for the plant is located in Stoddard County, Missouri, approximately 1.2 miles east of Idalia on County Road E. As proposed, the project is a 100-MW, simple-cycle combustion turbine generator. It will be powered by a Westinghouse 501D5A simple cycle/dry low-nitrogen oxides combustor. Fuel for the plant will be natural gas. No backup source of fuel, such as number 2 fuel oil, is proposed. The plant will occupy approximately three acres and will be located at an existing 12 acre electric distribution substation site. The main generator unit will be approximately 40 feet wide and 140 feet long. The exhaust stack will be 50 feet high. This type of combustion turbine is typically used for peak power generation and would normally be expected to operate only a few hundred to a few thousand hours per year.

Alternatives considered to constructing the project as proposed included no action, conservation and load management, power purchases, combined cycle combustion turbine technology, and an alternative site location.

Copies of the environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact along with the environmental analysis are available for review at, or can be obtained from, RUS at the address provided herein or from Jerry Bindel, Associated Electric Cooperative, PO Box 754, Springfield, Missouri, 65801–0754 telephone (417) 885–9272. Mr. Bindel's E-mail address is jbindel@aeci.org. These documents are also available at Bloomfield Public Library, 200 Seneca Street, Bloomfield, Missouri. Interested parties wishing to comment on the adequacy of the environmental assessment should do so within 30 days of the publication of this notice. RUS will take no action that would approve clearing or construction activities related to proposed combined cycle power plant prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period.

Dated: October 27, 1998.

Thomas L. Eddy,

Acting Assistant Administrator, Electric Program.

[FR Doc. 98–29435 Filed 11–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Submission For OMB Review; Comment Request

DOC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Agency: Bureau of the Census.

Title: Quarterly Financial Reports (QFR) Program.

Form Number(s): QFR–101(MG), QFR–101A(MG), QFR–102(TR), QFR–103(NB).

Agency Approval Number: 0607–0432.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Burden: 77,616 hours.

Number of Respondents: 13,186.

Avg Hours Per Response: 2 hours and 2 minutes.

Needs and Uses: The QFR Program has published up-to-date aggregate statistics on the financial results and position of U.S. corporations since 1947. It is a principal economic indicator that also provides financial data essential to calculation of key Government measures of national economic performance. The QFR Program provides timely, accurate data on business financial conditions for use by Government and private-sector organizations and individuals. Primary users of QFR data are governmental

organizations charged with economic policy-making responsibilities. Other data users include foreign countries, universities, financial analysts, unions, trade associations, public libraries, banking institutions, and U.S. and foreign corporations.

The Census Bureau has statutory authority granted in Title 13 USC, Section 91 and Public Law 105–252, signed into law by the President on October 9, 1998, to conduct the QFR program through September 30, 2005. This request is for extension of OMB approval.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: Quarterly and annually.

Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.

Legal Authority: Title 13 USC, Section 91 and P.L. 105–252.

OMB Desk Officer: Nancy Kirkendall, (202) 395–7313.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier, DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482–3272, Department of Commerce, room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to Nancy Kirkendall, OMB Desk Officer, room 10201, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: October 28, 1998.

Linda Engelmeier,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–29384 Filed 11–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–560–803]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Extruded Rubber Thread From Indonesia

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 3, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Russell Morris or Eric B. Greynolds, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 4012, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statue

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA''). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR part 351 (April 1, 1998).

Preliminary Determination

We preliminarily determine that extruded rubber thread (''ERT'') from Indonesia is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (''LTFV''), as provided in section 733 of the Act. The estimated margins of sales at LTFV are shown in the ''Suspension of Liquidation'' section of this notice.

Case History

Since the initiation of this investigation on April 20, 1998 (*see Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Investigations: Extruded Rubber Thread from Indonesia* (63 FR 23267) (''Notice of Initiation'')), the following events have occurred:

On April 22, 1998, the Department of Commerce (''Department'') requested information from the U.S. Embassy in Indonesia to identify producers/exporters of the subject merchandise.

On May 28, 1998, the International Trade Commission (''ITC'') published its preliminary determination that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is being materially injured, or threatened with material injury, by reason of imports from Indonesia of the subject merchandise (63 FR 29250).

On May 28, 1998, the Department issued the antidumping duty questionnaire to the following producers/exporters of ERT: P.T. Bakrie Rubber Industry (''Bakrie''), P.T. Swasthi Parama Mulya (''Swasthi''), P.T. Perkebunan Nusantara III (''Persero''), Cilatexindo Graha Alam P.T. (''Cilatexindo''). The questionnaire is divided into four sections. Section A requests general information concerning a company's corporate structure and business practices, the merchandise under investigation that it sells, and the sales of the merchandise in all of its markets. Sections B and C request home market sales listings and U.S. sales listings, respectively. Section D requests information on the cost of production (''COP'') of the foreign like product and constructed value (''CV'') of the subject merchandise.

On June 8, 1998 and July 27, 1998, Cilatexindo and Persero, respectively, stated that it has never directly or indirectly sold ERT to the U.S. market during the period of investigation. Upon receipt of Cilatexindo and Persero's statements, the Department consulted with U.S. Customs to verify each party's respective claim as it pertains to the period of investigation. The Department was able to confirm that both Cilatexindo and Persero did not ship the subject merchandise to the United States. (*See* Memorandum from Russell Morris to the File, ''Shipments of Subject Merchandise,'' dated August 24, 1998. The public version is on file in Room B–099, the Central Records Unit, of the Department of Commerce).

On July 8, 1998, Bakrie and Swasthi submitted their respective responses to Section A of the questionnaire. On July 21, 1998, Bakrie submitted Sections B and C of the questionnaire. On July 24, 1998, Swasthi submitted Sections B and C of the questionnaire. On August 17, 1998, we issued supplemental questionnaires to Bakrie and its affiliated U.S. reseller, Globe Manufacturing Co. (''Globe'') and Swasthi. On September 14, 1998, Swasthi submitted its response to the Department's Section C supplemental questionnaire. On September 25, 1998, Bakrie submitted its response to the Department's supplemental questionnaire for Sections A, B and C. On September 25, 1998, Bakrie also submitted its revised Section C questionnaire response which contained a separate submission of Globe's selling expenses and prices to its first unaffiliated customer.

On August 3, 1998, the petitioner made a timely request that the Department postpone the preliminary determination in this investigation. We did so on August 14, 1998, in accordance with section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act (*see Notice of Postponement of Time Limit for Antidumping Investigation: Extruded Rubber Thread from Indonesia,* 63 FR 43674).

Date of Sale

On September 3, 1998, the petitioner objected to Swasthi's use of date of invoice as the date of sale. Petitioner argued that given the actual sales processes of Swasthi, the appropriate date of sale is set on the purchase order date for U.S. sales, not the date on which the sale is invoiced as Swasthi has reported. Petitioner noted that there are no changes in the basic terms of each sale after the negotiation of the purchase order. The petitioner noted