

Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 60, No. 108

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

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

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. 95-036-1]

Availability of Environment Assessments and Findings of No Significant Impact

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We are advising the public that four environmental assessments and findings of no significant impact have been prepared by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service relative to the issuance of permits to allow the field testing of genetically engineered organisms. The environmental assessments provide a basis for our conclusion that the field testing of the genetically engineered organisms will not present a risk of introducing or disseminating a plant pest and will not

have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment. Based on its findings of no significant impact, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that environmental impact statements need not be prepared.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the environmental assessments and findings of no significant impact are available for public inspection at USDA, room 1141, South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday and Friday, except holidays. Persons wishing to inspect those documents are requested to call ahead on (202) 690-2817 to facilitate entry into the reading room.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Arnold Foudin, Deputy Director, Biotechnology Permits, BBEP, APHIS, Suite 5B05, 4700 River Road Unit 147, Riverdale, MD 20737-1237; (301) 734-7612. For copies of the environmental assessments and findings of no significant impact, write to Mr. Clayton Givens at the same address. Please refer to the permit numbers listed below when ordering documents.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The regulations in 7 CFR part 340 (referred to below as the regulations) regulate the introduction (importation, interstate movement, and release into the environment) of genetically engineered organisms and products that are plant pests or that there is reason to believe

are plant pests (regulated articles). A permit must be obtained or a notification acknowledged before a regulated article may be introduced into the United States. The regulations set forth the permit application requirements and the notification procedures for the importation, interstate movement, and release into the environment of a regulated article.

In the course of reviewing each permit application, APHIS assessed the impact on the environment that releasing the organisms under the conditions described in the permit application would have. APHIS has issued permits for the field testing of the organisms listed below after concluding that the organisms will not present a risk of plant pest introduction or dissemination and will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment. The environmental assessment and findings of no significant impact, which are based on data submitted by the applicants and on a review of other relevant literature, provide the public with documentation of APHIS' review and analysis of the environmental impacts associated with conducting the field tests.

Environmental assessments and findings of no significant impact have been prepared by APHIS relative to the issuance of permits to allow the field testing of the following genetically engineered organisms:

Permit No.	Permittee	Date issued	Organisms	Field test location
94-355-01	Betaseed, Incorporated	3-24-95	Sugar beet plants genetically engineered for resistance to beet necrotic yellow vein virus.	California, Idaho.
95-053-01	PanAmerican Seed Company	4-11-95	Petunia plants genetically engineered for resistance to bacteria and fungi.	Florida, Illinois.
94-362-01	Betaseed, Incorporated	4-25-95	Sugar beet plants genetically engineered for tolerance to the herbicide glufosinate.	Idaho.
95-003-01	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service.	5-03-95	Strains of the fungus <i>Fusarium graminearum</i> genetically engineered to express altered levels of mycotoxin production.	Illinois, Indiana.

The environmental assessments and findings of no significant impact have been prepared in accordance with: (1) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), (2) Regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), (3) USDA Regulations Implementing NEPA

(7 CFR part 1b), and (4) APHIS' NEPA Implementing Procedures (7 CFR part 372, 60 FR 6000-6005, February 1, 1995).

Done in Washington, DC, this 30th day of May 1995.

Terry L. Medley,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 95-13666 Filed 6-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-M

Forest Service**North Shore Project, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU), Washoe County, Nevada; Placer County, California****AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.**ACTION:** Notice, intent to prepare environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement on a proposal to implement ecosystem management principles on approximately 7,000 acres of National Forest System lands, north of Lake Tahoe, within the Lake Tahoe Basin. Proposed activities include harvest of approximately twenty to thirty million board feet of both merchantable and unmerchantable wood products. Dead and dying trees would be cut, and thinning of live trees is also proposed to improve forest health and to reduce fire danger. The proposed action also uses prescribed fire and analyzes post sale treatments, including watershed improvement projects. Stream and riparian area enhancement and wildlife habitat improvements are also planned.

DATES: Agencies and the public are invited to participate at any stage of the process; however, the Forest Supervisor requests that individuals concerned with the scope of the analysis comment by July 1, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments concerning the DEIS should be sent to the responsible official, Forest supervisor, LTBMU, 870 Emerald Bay Road, Suite 1, South Lake Tahoe, California, 96150.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Direct questions concerning the proposed action and alternatives to Joe Oden, Interdisciplinary team Leader, at (916) 573-2600 or the above address.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed action would harvest dead, dying, and diseased trees over approximately 7,000 acres of an 24,000-acre study area. Trees would be thinned from overstocked stands, over about 6,000 acres, some of which overlap the salvage acreage, and some of which is separate. Some of the 20 to 30 million board feet removed would be useful lumber; much of the timber removed would have no commercial value.

Trees would be removed from slope less than thirty percent by tractor skidding systems. Trees would be flown from slopes over thirty percent by helicopter. No new permanent roads would be constructed; however, construction of additional temporary access roads and landing sites may be

required, as well as reconstruction and restoration of existing roads.

The proposed action includes treatments that would follow tree removal activities. This would include (but is not limited to) site preparation, planting, treatment of slash generated by the project, fuel treatment adjacent to residential areas, closing of temporary and unneeded roads, and restoration of landings. The use of prescribed fire will be analyzed, both as a post-harvest treatment and as a means to reintroduce fire to the ecosystem on untreated areas. Wildlife habitat would be improved by thinning stands of small lodgepole pines and underburning older brushfields.

Heritage (historic archaeological) resources are dispersed throughout the study area. Most are the remains of 19th century logging. Sites determined to be significant will be protected. In addition to mitigation negotiated with the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation, a key component of the analysis is to seek and address enhancement opportunities for representative heritage properties.

Watershed restoration projects and road closures are also included in the proposed action if they are, in the language of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)—“connected”, “cumulative” or are “ripe for decision”.

These actions are proposed to promote stable ecosystems as described in “desired condition” portions of the Forest Plan and the North Shore Ecosystem Report.

Beginning in the 1850's many of the 200-500 year old pine trees around Lake Tahoe were harvested in support of silver mining activities of the Comstock Lode. Earlier, the forest had consisted of diverse species that better resisted drought and insect attacks. After logging slowed in the 1890's, the area began to revegetate naturally. But a new and different forest grew to replace the old. In the absence of frequently recurring fires, dense thickets of moisture-loving fir trees replaced much of the open pine forest that has been cut. The drought that began in 1987 weakened and killed many of the fir trees that had sprouted after the massive Comstock cutting.

Forty years of fire suppression has dramatically increased the density of trees and the amount of dead wood, both standing and on the ground. Members of the public have expressed concern over the large numbers of dead trees and the amount of forest fuels now present. Many requests have been made for projects to remove timber to reduce safety hazards, fire danger, and to improve visual quality. Such projects would reduce the “fuel loading” and could decrease the risk and severity of

a catastrophic fire. Additionally, thinning of overstocked stands can be an effective way to reduce the risk of future catastrophic insect and disease outbreaks.

The environmental analysis provides the decisionmaker—the LTBMU Forest Supervisor—with an evaluation of what will happen if nothing is done, and what may result from the proposed action and other alternatives. Such disclosure will allow a reasoned choice between management options. If an alternative other than No Action is selected the work should proceed without delay. Delaying the removal of dead, dying, or diseased trees can reduce their commercial value. The anticipated high cost of implementation could deter potential bidders as the soundness of the trees declines. Consequently, project implementation is expected to begin during the spring or summer of 1996.

Over sixty agencies, organizations, and individuals were notified of this proposed project through the LTBMU NEPA Status Report. Public meetings were held on March 10, 13 and 24, as part of the scoping process. Some people also provided written comments. Tahoe Regional Planning agency staff was briefed about the project on March 13, 1995.

Participants in the planning process will be sent copies of the draft EIS for the public comment period. Availability of the draft EIS will also be noticed in the **Federal Register** and the Tahoe Daily Tribune, the LTBMU's newspaper of record. Written comments received by July 1, 1994 will be addressed in the draft EIS.

The “no action” alternative (Alternative 1) proposes a continuation of the current types of management activities currently conducted in the study area, without imposing impacts from proposed fuels treatments, logging, wildlife or streamzone enhancements, or watershed improvement work.

Alternative 3 emphasizes fuels treatments to reduce the threat of intense wildfires. It harvests dead, dying, diseased, and overcrowded trees over approximately 3,600 acres, concentrating on areas of high tree mortality and areas adjacent to residential neighborhoods. Removal of 15 to 20 MMBF of both merchantable and unmerchantable material is anticipated. This alternative includes all components of the proposed action, except when modified as described. Tree removal activities and prescribed underburning would be located adjacent to proposed fuelbreaks to maximize fire defensible space strategies.

Alternative 4 represents a "wildlife habitat emphasis." It includes harvests of dead, dying, diseased, and overcrowded trees over approximately 3,000 acres, for the purpose of improving wildlife habitat. Removal of about 10 MMBF of both merchantable and unmerchantable material is anticipated. This alternative includes all components of the proposed action, except as modified: while treatment of activity fuels will occur, the use of prescribed fire as a management tool will be limited to improving wildlife habitat; a greater level of road closures would be implemented to reduce disturbance to wildlife.

Implementation of this project requires permits from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region. Additionally, encroachment permits from the California and Nevada Departments of Transportation will be required for project implementation. Consultation with both the California and Nevada State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (AHP) in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) is required. Concurrence from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is needed if the Forest Service Biological Assessment results in a "may affect" determination.

The decision on this analysis, pursuant to NEPA, is made by Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Forest Supervisor, Robert Harris, as the Forest Service is the lead agency under NEPA. There is no other joint lead agency and no cooperating agencies under NEPA.

The draft EIS is anticipated to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency and made available to the public for comment in September 1995.

The final EIS and its Record of Decision is expected in January 1996. The decision will be appealable under Forest Service regulations found at 36 CFR 215.

The comment period for the draft EIS will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency's notice of availability appears in the **Federal Register**. The public will also be informed of the availability of the DEIS by news releases issued to the media in the Lake Tahoe region. It is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate at that time. To be the most helpful, comments on the draft EIS should be as specific as possible and may address the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed (see the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA at 40 CFR 1503.3).

In addition, Federal court decisions have established that reviewers of draft EIS' 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 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final EIS. "City of Angoon v. Hodel," (9th Circuit, 1986) and "Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris," 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). The reason for this is to ensure that substantive comments and objections are made available for the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final.

Dated: May 23, 1995.

Robert E. Harris,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 95-13725 Filed 6-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-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 Traffic Act of 1930, as amended, may request, in accordance with section 353.22 or 355.22 of the Department of Commerce (the Department) Regulations (19 CFR 353.22/355.22 (1993)), 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 June 30, 1995, interested parties may request administrative review of the following orders, findings, or suspended investigations, with anniversary dates in June for the following periods:

	Period
Antidumping Duty Proceedings	
Belgium: Sugar (A-351-077)	06/01/94-05/31/95
Canada:	
Oil Country Tubular Goods (A-122-506)	06/01/94-05/31/95
Red Raspberries (A-122-401)	06/01/94-05/31/95
France:	
Calcium Aluminate Flux (A-427-812)	03/25/94-05/31/95
Large Power Transformers (A-427-030)	06/01/94-05/31/95
Sugar (A-427-078)	06/01/94-05/31/95
Germany:	
Barium Carbonate (A-428-061)	06/01/94-05/31/95
High-Tenacity Rayon Filament Yarn (A-428-810)	06/01/94-05/31/95
Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured (A-428-802)	06/01/94-05/31/95
Sugar (A-428-082)	06/01/94-05/31/95
Italy:	
Large Power Transformers (A-475-031)	06/01/94-05/31/95
Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured (A-475-802)	06/01/94-05/31/95