ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden, including use of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments should reference OMB No. 0581–0102 and Hawaiian Papaya Marketing Order No. 928, and be mailed to the Docket Clerk, Fruit and Vegetable Division, AMS, USDA, PO Box 96456, room 2523-S, Washington, DC, 20090-6456. Comments should reference the docket number and the date and page of this issue of the **Federal Register**. All comments received will be available for public inspection in the Office of the Docket Clerk during regular USDA business hours at 14th and Independence Ave. SW, Washington, DC, Room 22523 South Building.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments also will become a matter of the public record.

Dated: April 24, 1997.

Sharon Bomer Lauritsen,

Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division.

[FR Doc. 97–11108 Filed 4–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Utilities Service

Palmetto 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 (FONSI) with respect to a request to an anticipated request by Palmetto Electric Cooperative for financing assistance to construct a district office facility in Jasper County, South Carolina. The FONSI is based on a borrower's environmental report (BER) submitted to RUS by Palmetto Electric Cooperative. RUS conducted an independent evaluation of the report and concurs with its scope and content. In accordance with RUS Environmental Policies and Procedures, 7 CFR 1794.61, RUS has adopted the BER as its environmental assessment for the project.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The district office facility is proposed to be located on the northern side of U.S. Highway 278 on the western side of a railroad right-of-way south of State Route 141. The size of the proposed site for the district office facility is approximately 40 acres of which approximately 20 acres would be developed.

The district office facility would consist of a 20,000 square foot administration building, a 10,000 square foot warehouse and operations building, a 3,200 square foot fleet maintenance building with covered car and truck wash and diesel and gasoline refueling station with two 2,500 gallon underground storage tanks, a 2,400 square foot transformer and metering equipment repair and maintenance building, an asphalt covered pole storage yard, a concrete covered transformer storage area with oil spill containment, two 3,200 square foot wire and vehicle equipment storage sheds, paved parking to accommodate 50 employee, 75 visitor, and 25 company vehicles, a 100-foot high, self-supporting lattice type radio and microwave communications tower, and a 200 kilowatt emergency diesel power electric generator to supply backup power to the facility in the event of a power outage.

RUS considered the alternatives of no action, expanding Palmetto Electric Cooperative's existing district office, and three alternative site locations. Under the no action alternative, RUS would not approve financing assistance for construction of the district office facility. Since RUS believes that Palmetto Electric Cooperative has a need to expand its district facility to adequately serve its rapidly growing consumer base, it has determined that the no action alternative is not acceptable. The expansion of the existing district office is not practicable as there is not enough space available there for the proposed new facilities. Of the four sites considered for locating the proposed district, the preferred site was selected based on flexibility of site layout and reasonable cost.

Copies of the BER and FONSI are available for review at, or can be obtained from, RUS at the address provided herein or from Mr. Berl Davis, Jr., Palmetto Electric Cooperative, P.O. Box 21239, 111 Mathews Drive, Hilton Head, South Carolina, telephone (803) 681–5551.

Dated: April 24, 1997.

Adam M. Golodner,

Deputy Administrator, Program Operations.

[FR Doc. 97–11185 Filed 4–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–15–P

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

Procurement List Addition

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

ACTION: Addition to the Procurement List.

SUMMARY: This action adds to the Procurement List a service to be furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 30, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, Crystal Square 3, Suite 403, 1735 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202–3461.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Beverly Milkman (703) 603–7740.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 7, 1997, the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled published notice (62 F.R. 10519) of proposed addition to the Procurement List. Comments were received from two Government agencies, three minority business associations, one small business owner, a labor union, two political organizations, 133 employees of the Government facility where the service will be performed, two contractors at that facility, an employee of the current janitorial contractor, and one other individual. All commenters opposed the addition of this service to the Procurement List.

This service is currently being performed by a small disadvantaged business which is graduating from the Small Business Administration's 8(a) Program. The two commenting Government agencies claimed that removal of the service from the 8(a) Program would cause severe adverse impact on the Program's ability to provide business development opportunities for small disadvantaged businesses, both nationally and at the Government agency where the service is being performed. Another commenter claimed that the 8(a) Program cannot

meet its goals if the Committee's Javits-Wagner-O'Day (JWOD) Program continues to remove services from the 8(a) Program, and that the Committee's practice of adding these services when a specific 8(a) contractor graduates from the 8(a) Program ignores the legislative intent of the Small Business Act and the responsibility of Government agencies to support the 8(a) Program. Other commenters declared that Congress did not intend for the JWOD and 8(a) Programs to compete, and that 8(a) contracts should remain in that Program.

The 8(a) Program's share of Government contracting dollars is approximately ten times the size of the JWOD Program's share. Consequently, the Committee does not believe that adding this service to the Procurement List, will have a severe adverse impact on the 8(a) Program, even if the limited number of other 8(a) services which have been added to the Procurement List are taken into account. Similarly, the Government agency where the service is being performed has an extremely successful 8(a) Program of which the contract for this service represents a minute portion. As a result, the Committee does not believe that adding this service to the JWOD Program will have a substantial negative impact on the agency's overall 8(a) Program.

The Committee's priority over small business setaside programs has long been established, and the Committee believes its policy of only adding 8(a) services to the Procurement List when a contractor graduates from the 8(a) Program shows that the Committee attempts to minimize its impact on small disadvantaged businesses who have performed the services and still remain in the 8(a) Program. Because JWOD nonprofit agencies are normally in the same size range as small disadvantaged businesses and can perform the same types of work, it is inevitable that there will be some overlap between them. The Committee does not know of any legislative intent that they not compete or that the JWOD Program be limited in carrying out its statutory mission to services which have not previously been performed by 8(a) contractors.

One commenter, a trade association representing 8(a) companies, stated that all Government contracts should be available to competition and that the JWOD Act should be amended to limit Government awards to JWOD nonprofit agencies to amounts below a specific dollar ceiling.

These proposals, which would necessitate changes to the 8(a) Program as well, would require legislative action and are thus outside the scope of the Committee's decision on this addition to the Procurement List.

The same commenter suggested that 8(a) contractors should be permitted to subcontract with JWOD nonprofit agencies so that both 8(a) and JWOD entities would benefit from the same Government contracts. The Committee explored this approach with representatives of the Government contracting activity, which raised the issue too late for the proposal to be given the thorough consideration the Committee deemed necessary. The Committee does intend to consider in the coming months whether the proposed approach warrants in-depth examination for possible future use.

Many commenters noted that a large number of janitorial employees at the Government facility would be displaced by the Committee's action, despite, in some cases, long years of excellent service. One commenter claimed that if any current employees were hired by the JWOD nonprofit agency, they would take a substantial pay cut. Two commenters asked whether the Committee would provide for the displaced workers. Another commenter suggested that people with disabilities be hired by the current 8(a) contractor as vacancies occur rather than displacing the current workers.

The Committee is sensitive to the issue of displacing longstanding workers at janitorial projects, and permits nonprofit agencies performing JWOD contracts to accommodate such workers on a transitional basis as much as possible consistent with its statutory requirement that the majority of workers on JWOD contracts be people with severe disabilities. JWOD nonprofit agencies, like all Government service contractors, are required to maintain the union wage for the first year after they succeed a union contractor, as they are doing in this case. If the new workforce does not elect to be unionized, after the first year, the JWOD nonprofit agency must pay a Department of Labor-determined wage rate, which normally tracks prevailing union wages. In this case, the new rate, while lower than the current union rate, significantly exceeds the minimum wage.

Since the current contractor is graduating from the 8(a) Program and is not eligible to perform the contract in the future, the suggestion that it continue employing the existing workforce and hire people with severe disabilities as vacancies occur is not possible. In addition, people with severe disabilities have an unemployment rate exceeding 65 percent, well above any other group. Accordingly, the Committee believes that the guarantee of jobs for a large number of people with severe disabilities outweighs the possible harm to the displaced workers, who will be more likely to find other employment. In addition, NISH has agreed to try and help interested displaced workers find janitorial jobs by referring them to other nonprofit agencies in the area that participate in the JWOD Program.

Many commenters urged that the displaced workers be relocated to other jobs at the same Government facility or other Government facilities. This approach, while laudatory, is outside the Committee's jurisdiction.

The union representing the current workers, and other commenters, urged the Committee to work with the union to avoid pitting union and disabled workers against each other. Other commenters expressed fears that the Committee's action will break the union, and stated that it would be better to keep the contract unionized to maintain current wage levels. Many commenters claimed that the JWOD nonprofit agency's workers would be taken advantage of in the areas of wages and benefits because they will not be union members.

The Committee has no objection to nonprofit agencies with JWOD contracts being unionized, and some of them are union shops when the workers have elected to be represented by unions. As indicated in a previous paragraph, wages and benefit levels under the JWOD contract will—if the workforce is not unionized after the first year—be lower than those that have existed in the union shop, but consistent with prevailing wages for comparable jobs in the area.

Two commenters claimed that the quality of service will decrease once the JWOD nonprofit agency becomes the contractor. Another commenter claimed that people with severe disabilities will injure themselves or harm critical flight hardware at the facility as they clean. The nonprofit agency is already successfully performing janitorial work at several other Government agencies, and the contracting activity has advised the Committee that it believes the nonprofit agency is capable of performing the work involved. As a consequence, the Committee has no reason to doubt that the nonprofit agency will be able to perform the services in question successfully and without injury to personnel or equipment.

After consideration of the material presented to it concerning capability of qualified nonprofit agencies to provide

the service and impact of the addition on the current or most recent contractors, the Committee has determined that the service listed below is suitable for procurement by the Federal Government under 41 U.S.C. 46–48c and 41 CFR 51–2.4.

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities other than the small organizations that will furnish the service to the Government.

2. The action will not have a severe economic impact on current contractors for the service.

3. The action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the service to the Government.

4. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c) in connection with the service proposed for addition to the Procurement List.

Accordingly, the following service is hereby added to the Procurement List:

Janitorial/Custodial, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

This action does not affect current contracts awarded prior to the effective date of this addition or options that may be exercised under those contracts.

Beverly L. Milkman,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 97–11135 Filed 4–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings Nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations

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

ACTION: Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings Nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is notifying the public of its determination not to revoke the antidumping duty orders and findings nor to terminate the suspended investigations listed below.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 30, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Panfeld or the analyst listed under Antidumping Proceeding at: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Commerce (the Department) may revoke an antidumping duty order or finding or terminate a suspended investigation, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(d)(4)(iii), if no interested party has requested an administrative review for four consecutive annual anniversary months and no domestic interested party objects to the revocation or requests an administrative review.

We had not received a request to conduct an administrative review for the most recent four consecutive annual anniversary months. Therefore, pursuant to § 353.25(d)(4)(i) of the Department's regulations, on March 3, 1997, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice of intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations and served written notice of the intent to each domestic interested party on the Department's service list in each case. Within the specified time frame, we received objections from domestic interested parties to our intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations. Therefore, because domestic interested parties objected to our intent to revoke or terminate, we no longer intend to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings or to terminate the suspended investigations.

Antidumping Proceeding

A–602–039
Australia
Canned Bartlett Pears
Objection Date: March 4, 1997
Objector: California Pear Advisory Board
Contact: Mathew Rosenbaum at (202) 482–0198

A–122–503
Canada
Construction Castings
Objection Date: March 6, 1997
Objector: East Jordan Iron Works
Contact: Laurel LaCivita at (202) 482–4470

A–337–602
Chile
Standard Carnations
Objection Date: March 31, 1997
Objector: Floral Trade Council
Contact: Lyn Johnson at (202) 482–5287

A–427–602
France
Brass Sheet & Strip
Objection Date: March 11, 1997
Objector: Copper & Brass Fabricators Council
Contact: Thomas Killiam at (202) 482–2704

A–508–602
Israel
Oil Country Tubular Goods
Objection Date: March 12, 1997
Objector: North Star Steel Ohio
Contact: Michael Heaney at (202) 482–4475

A–475–401
Italy
Certain Valves and Connections of Brass, for Use in Fire Protection Equipment
Objection Date: March 28, 1997
Objector: AFAC Inc.
Contact: Leon McNeill at (202) 482–4236

A–475–601
Italy
Brass Sheet & Strip
Objection Date: March 11, 1997
Objector: Copper & Brass Fabricators Council, Inc.
Contact: Tom Killiam at (202) 482–2704

A–588–015
Japan
Television's
Objection Date: March 31, 1997
Objector: AFL-CIO, et al
Contact: Sheila Forbes at (202) 482–5253

A–401–601
Sweden
Brass Sheet & Strip
Objection Date: March 11, 1997
Objector: Copper & Brass Fabricators Council, Inc.
Contact: Tom Killiam at (202) 482–2704

A–583–803
Taiwan
Light-Walled Welded Rectangular Carbon Steel Tubing
Objection Date: March 25, 1997
Objector: Hannibal Industries, Inc.
Contact: Thomas O. Barlow at (202) 482–0410

A–570–002
The People's Republic of China
Chloropicrin
Objection Date: March 31, 1997
Objector: Niklor Chemical Co., et al
Contact: Andrea Chu at (202) 482–4794

Dated: April 17, 1997.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 97–11177 Filed 4–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P