Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 66, No. 12

Thursday, January 18, 2001

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for Southwestern Region, Arizona, Coconino County, Coconino National Forests

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

SUMMARY: The Coconino National Forest is planning to prepare an environmental impact statement on a proposal to improve grassland and woodland conditions for wildlife and manage livestock grazing use on the Pickett Lake and Padre Canyon Grazing Allotments during the next 10 years.

DATES: Comments in response to this Notice of Intent concerning the scope of the analysis should be received in writing by on or before February 20, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to USDA Forest Service, Coconino National Forest, Peaks Ranger Station, 5075 N Hwy 89, Flagstaff, AZ 86004. Electronic mail may be sent to mhannemann@fs.fed.us.

Responsible Official: The Forest Supervisor of the Coconino National Forest, Supervisor's Office 2323 Greenlaw Lane, Flagstaff, AZ 86004, will decide what actions are most appropriate for managing the Pickett and Padre Range Allotments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mike Hannemann, Interdisciplinary Team Leader, Peaks Ranger District, (520) 526–0866.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposal includes 14,774 acres of pinyon, juniper and ponderosa pine treatments. Ponderosa pine cuts would be on trees <6″ in diameter at breast height (DBH). Slash crushing and seeding will be done in pinyon and juniper treatment areas where slash is heavy and dense trees have removed the grass seed source from the area. Approximately $258,810 will be spent on cutting the trees. Approximately $95,500 will be spent on slash crushing, harrowing and seeding. Approximately $126,500 would be spent on archaeological surveys on the tree cutting areas. The Forest Service will look for grants and partners to supplement normal Forest Service funds to complete the pinyon and juniper treatments, slash crushing, harrowing and seeding.

This proposal also has a Forest Service permit of up to 850 cattle from June 1 to September 30 on the 34,814 acres Pickett Lake Allotment and up to 125 cattle from August 1 to September 30 on the 20,993 acres Padre Canyon Allotment. This is a 10% reduction in cattle use on Pickett Lake Allotment and a 31% reduction in cattle use on the Padre Canyon Allotment. In addition, this proposal has a combined grazing system option of up to 913 cattle from June 1 to September 30 on both allotment areas, a 14% overall reduction in cattle use. In addition to maintaining current range structures, approximately $25,600 will be spent on one mile of barbwire fence, four miles of pipeline and five drinkers. The Forest Service will spend approximately $13,700 primarily for materials and the permittee will spend approximately $11,900 primarily for installation of the improvements.

Preliminary issues include the effect of grazing on the environment, especially watershed conditions and pronghorn antelope habitat.

The Proposed action was mailed to 104 individuals, organizations and cooperating resource agencies for review and comment on January 5, 2001. From comments received, the Team will develop statements to capture the substantive issues and developed alternatives other than the proposed action. If you would like a copy of the proposed action please contact our office. Your comments will be included in our environmental analysis.

It is anticipated that environmental analysis and preparation of the draft and final environmental impact statements will take about six months. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement can be expected April of 2001 and the Final EIS in summer. The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement extends 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. To be the most helpful, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible and may address the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed (see Council of Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3).

In addition, Federal court decisions have established that reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewers' position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* v. *NRDC* 435 US 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft state may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. *City of Angoon* v. *Hodel 9th Circuit,* 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc* v. *Harris,* 490F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). The reason for this is to ensure that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposal action, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council of Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Dated: January 5, 2001.

Jim Golden,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 01–1391 Filed 1–17–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Intergovernmental Advisory Committee Meeting

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Intergovernmental Advisory Committee (IAC) will meet on February 1, 2001, at the Hilton Hotel, 921 SW 6th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204–1296. The purpose of the meeting is to continue discussions on the implementation of the Northwest Forest Plan (NFP). The meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m. and continue until 3:30 p.m. Agenda items to be discussed include, but are not limited to: IAC Topics for advice, the Aquatic Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Plan, and an update on the survey and Manage Record of Decision. The IAC meeting will be open to the public and is fully accessible for people with disabilities. Interpreters are available upon request in advance. Written comments may be submitted for the record at the meeting. Time will also be scheduled for oral public comments. Interested persons are encouraged to attend.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions regarding this meeting may be directed to Steve Odell, Executive Director, Regional Ecosystem Office, 333 SW, 1st Avenue, P.O. Box 3623, Portland, OR 97208 (Phone: 503–808–2166).

Dated: January 11, 2001.

Stephen J. Odell,

Designated Federal Official.

[FR Doc. 01–1467 Filed 1–17–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Export Administration

Action Affecting Export Privileges; Michel V. Diago; Order Amending the Order Denying Permission To Apply for or Use Export Licenses

On, September 7, 1997, the acting director of the Office of Exporter Services entered an Order (the 1994 Order) against Michel V. Daigo denying his export privileges until February 25, 2003, based upon his February 25, 1993, conviction in the Untied States District Court for the Northern District of California of violating the Export Administration Act of 1979 as amended (50 U.S.C.A. app. 2401–2420 (1991, Supp. 1993, and Public Law 103–277, July 5, 1994) [1] the Act). The 1994 Order was issued under the authority of Section1 1(h) of the Act and Sections 766.25 and 750.8(a) of the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR Parts 730–774 (1999)) (the Regulations). The 1994 Order was published in the **Federal Register** (50 FR 47299, September 15, 1994).

In the Matter of: MICHAEL V. DIAGO, 1183 Calle del Arroyo, Sonoma, California 95476.

On, October 18, 1994 Diago, through counsel, filed an appeal from the Order with the Under Secretary for Export Administration (Under Secretary), pursuant to Part 789 (currently Part 756) of the Regulations. On December 22, 2000, the Under Secretary issued his final decision on that appeal and granted partial relief from the terms of the 1994 Order by terminating the denial period as of December 31, 2000.

Accordingly, the 1994 Order is hereby amended to as follows:

Ordered

I. The date ''February 25, 2003'' in fourth paragraph and in the paragraphs labeled II and V of the 1994 Order is amended to read December 31, 2000.

II. A copy of this Order shall be delivered to Diago. This Order shall be published in the **Federal Register.**

Dated: January 2, 2001.

Eileen Albanese,

Director, Office of Exporter Services.

[FR Doc. 01–1392 Filed 1–17–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DT–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of opportunity to request administrative review of antidumping or countervailing duty order, finding, or suspended investigation.

Background

Each year during the anniversary month of the publication of an antidumping or countervailing duty order, finding, or suspension of investigation, an interested party, as defined in section 771(9) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), may request, in accordance with section 351.213 (2000) of the Department of Commerce (the Department) regulations, that the Department conduct an administrative review of that antidumping or countervailing duty order, finding, or suspended investigation.

Opportunity to Request a Review:

Not later than the last day of January 2001, interested parties may request an administrative review of the following orders, findings, or suspended investigations, with anniversary dates in January for the following periods:

	Period
Antidumping duty proceedings	
Brazil: Brass Sheet and Strip, A–351–603	1/1/00–12/31/00
Brazil: Stainless Steel Wire Rod, A–351–819	1/1/00–12/31/00
Canda: Brass Sheet and Strip, A–122–601	1/1/00–12/31/00
France: Anhydrous Sodium Metasilicate (ASM), A–427–098	1/1/00–12/31/00
France: Stainless Steel Wire Rods, A–427–811	1/1/00–12/31/00
Taiwan: Stainless Steel Cooking Ware, A–583–603	1/1/00–12/31/00
The People's Republic of China: Potassium Permanganate, A–570–001	1/1/00–12/31/00
The Republic of Korea: Stainless Steel Cooking Ware, A–580–601	1/1/00–12/31/00

[1] The Act expired on August 20, 1994, Executive Order 12924 (3 CFR 1994 Comp. 917 (1995)), extended by Presidential Notices of August 15, 1995 (3 CFR, 1995 Comp. 501 (1996)), August 14, 1996 (3 CFR 1996 Comp. 298 (1997)), August 13, 1997 (3 CFR 1997 Comp. 306 (1998)), and August 13, 1998 (3 CFR, 1998 Comp. 294 (1999)), continued the Export Administration Regulations in effect under IEEPA. The Act was renewed and signed into law by the President on November 13, 2000.