

Background

Income Eligibility Standards

The eligibility of households for the Food Stamp Program, except those in which, in accordance with Section 5(a) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. 2014(a), all members are receiving "benefits under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act [], supplemental security income [SSI] benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act [], or aid to the aged, blind, or disabled under title I, X, XIV, or XV of the Social Security Act. * * *", is determined by comparing their incomes to the appropriate income eligibility standards (limits). Pursuant to Section 5(c)(2) of the Act, households containing an elderly or disabled member are required to have qualifying net incomes, while households which do not contain an elderly or disabled member must have qualifying net incomes *and* qualifying gross incomes. Households in which all members are receiving Social Security Act title IV benefits or SSI are "categorically eligible;" under 7 CFR 273.2(j)(2) their incomes do not have to be below the income limits.

As provided in Section 5(c)(1) of the Act, the net and gross income limits applicable to food stamp eligibility are derived from the Federal income poverty guidelines established under Section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act, 42 U.S.C. 9902(2). The net income limit is 100 percent of the poverty line. The gross income limit is 130 percent of the poverty line. The guidelines are updated annually. Based on that update, the Food Stamp Program's income eligibility standards are updated each October 1. Instructions for implementation of the required adjustments for October 1, 1997, were issued by the Deputy Administrator of the Food and Consumer Service, Food Stamp Program, in a July 29, 1997, memorandum to all State Food Stamp Program Directors. The revised income eligibility standards for the 48 States (including the District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands), Alaska and Hawaii are as follows:

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM—OCTOBER 1, 1997—SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

Household size	48 States ¹	Alaska	Hawaii
----------------	------------------------	--------	--------

Net Monthly Income Eligibility Standards (100 Percent of Poverty Level)

1	\$658	\$823	\$ 756
2	885	1,106	1,017
3	1,111	1,390	1,278

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM—OCTOBER 1, 1997—SEPTEMBER 30, 1998—Continued

Household size	48 States ¹	Alaska	Hawaii
4	1,338	1,673	1,539
5	1,565	1,956	1,800
6	1,791	2,240	2,060
7	2,018	2,523	2,321
8	2,245	2,806	2,582
Each add. member	+227	+284	+261

Gross Monthly Income Eligibility Standards (130 Percent of Poverty Level)

1	\$855	\$1,070	\$983
2	1,150	1,438	1,322
3	1,445	1,806	1,661
4	1,739	2,175	2,000
5	2,034	2,543	2,339
6	2,329	2,911	2,678
7	2,623	3,280	3,018
8	2,918	3,648	3,357
Each add. Member	+295	+369	+340

Gross Monthly Income Eligibility Standards For Households Where Elderly Disabled Are A Separate Household (165 Percent of Poverty Level)

1	\$1,085	\$1,358	\$1,248
2	1,459	1,825	1,678
3	1,833	2,293	2,108
4	2,207	2,760	2,539
5	2,581	3,228	2,969
6	2,955	3,695	3,399
7	3,329	4,163	3,830
8	3,703	4,630	4,260
Each add. Member	+374	+468	+431

¹ Includes District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

Thrifty Food Plan (TFP) and Allotments

As provided for in Section 3(o) of the Act, the TFP is a plan for the consumption of foods of different types (food groups) that a household might use to provide nutritious meals and snacks for household members. The plan reflects a diet required to feed a family of four persons consisting of a man and a woman aged 20 to 50, a child 6 to 8 and a child 9 to 11. The cost of the TFP is adjusted monthly to reflect changes in the costs of the food groups.

The TFP is also the basis for establishing food stamp allotments. "Allotment" is defined in Section 3(a) of the Act as "the total value of coupons a household is authorized to receive during each month." Food stamp allotments are adjusted periodically to reflect the changes in food cost levels indicated in the changing amounts of the TFP. Prior to the amendment of Section 3(o) of the Act by Section 804 of Pub. L. 104-193, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, allotment

amounts were established on each October 1 at 103% of the cost of the TFP in the previous June. Amended Section 3(o)(4) of the Act now provides that the TFP will be adjusted each October 1 to reflect the exact cost, or 100%, of the TFP for the previous June, rounding the results to the nearest lower dollar increment for each household size, except that on October 1, 1996, the TFP was not to have been reduced below the amounts in effect on September 30, 1996.

To obtain the maximum food stamp allotment for each household size for the period October 1, 1997, to September 30, 1998, June 1997 TFP costs for the above described four-person household were divided by four, multiplied by the appropriate household size and economy of scale factor, in accordance with Section 3(o)(1) of the Act, and the final result was rounded down to the nearest dollar. The maximum benefit, or allotment, is paid to households with no net income. For a household with income, the household's allotment is determined by reducing the maximum allotment for the household's size by 30 percent of the individual household's net income in accordance with Section 8(a) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. 2017(a). The following table shows the current allotments for the 48 States and the District of Columbia.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM—OCTOBER 1, 1997—SEPTEMBER 30, 1998
[Maximum Food Stamp Allotments]

Household size	48 States ¹
1	\$122
2	224
3	321
4	408
5	485
6	582
7	643
8	735
Each Additional Person	+92

¹ 48 States and the District of Columbia.

Dated: November 25, 1997.

Yvette S. Jackson,
Administrator, Food and Consumer Service.
[FR Doc. 97-31972 Filed 12-5-97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410-30-U

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Utilities Service

Kodiak Electric Association, Inc.; 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), pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and RUS Environmental Policies and Procedures (7 CFR Part 1794), has made a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) with respect to a project proposed by Kodiak Electric Association, Inc. (KEA), of Kodiak, Alaska. The proposed project consists of constructing a 5.0 to 7.5 megawatt (MW) combustion turbine cogeneration power plant, a substation, a fuel storage tank, and an approximately four mile-long 69 kV transmission line. The purpose of the project is to increase KEA's generation capacity to meet future power demand, to produce steam for the U.S. Coast Guard for space heating, and to increase reliability of electric power service to KEA customers including the U.S. Coast Guard. The need for this project was established in KEA's 1994 Power Requirements Study, 1994 Power Generation Study, and 1996 Power Generation Study Supplement.

RUS has concluded that the impacts from the proposed project would not be significant and that the proposed action is not a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Therefore, the preparation of an environmental impact statement is not necessary.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nurul Islam, Environmental Protection Specialist, Engineering and Environmental Staff, Rural Utilities Service, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Stop 1571, Washington, DC 20250-1571, telephone (202) 720-1784, e-mail: nislam@rus.usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: RUS, in accordance with its environmental policies and procedures, required that KEA prepare a Borrower's Environmental Report (BER) reflecting the potential impacts of the proposed facilities. The BER, which includes input from federal, state, and local agencies, has been reviewed and adopted as RUS's Environmental Assessment for the project in accordance with 7 CFR 1794.61. RUS has concluded that the BER represents an accurate assessment of the environmental impacts of the project. Based on coordination with appropriate federal and state agencies, potential impacts to water quality, air quality, wetlands, federally listed threatened or endangered species, cultural resources, noise levels, and visibility can either be

avoided through project design or mitigated to less than significant levels. The project should have no impact on floodplains, important farmland, prime forest land, or formally classified areas and would be consistent with the policies of the Alaska Coastal Management Program.

Alternatives to the project as proposed were considered, including alternative power generation sites, alternative transmission line routes, alternative fuel delivery and storage facilities, various alternative energy sources, power demand and load management alternatives, and the no-action alternative. RUS has considered these alternatives and has concluded that the project, as proposed, will allow KEA to provide adequate and reliable electric service to its customers on Kodiak Island, including the U.S. Coast Guard, with minimum adverse impacts.

Copies of the BER and FONSI are available for review at RUS at the aforementioned address or may be reviewed at or obtained from the offices of KEA, P.O. Box 787, Kodiak, Alaska, 99615, Telephone (907) 486-7700. Copies are also available for public review at the Kodiak City Library and the U.S. Coast Guard Integrated Support Command Administration Building, Second Deck.

Dated: December 2, 1997.

Adam M. Golodner,
Deputy Administrator, Program Operations.
[FR Doc. 97-32030 Filed 12-5-97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-809]

Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From the Republic of Korea; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review of circular welded non-alloy steel pipe from the Republic of Korea.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe from the Republic of Korea. The period of review is November 1, 1995 through October 31, 1996. This review covers imports of pipe from four producers/exporters.

We have preliminarily found that sales of subject merchandise have been made below normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the U.S. price and normal value.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. We will issue the final results not later than 120 days from the date of publication of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 8, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cynthia Thirumalai, Marian Wells, or Rosa Jeong, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4087, 482-6309, and 482-1278 respectively.

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations refer to the regulations, codified at 19 CFR part 353, April 1997.

Background

Since the publication of *Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results, Partial Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Initiation of Changed Circumstances Review*, on July 15, 1997 (62 FR 37865), the following has occurred.

On July 25, 1997, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire to Korea Iron and Steel Co., Ltd. (KISCO) and Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Union) asking about issues of affiliation. The companies responded to the affiliation questions on August 6, 1997. We notified Union and KISCO in an October 22, 1997, letter that their responses should be consolidated into one response (see "Collapsing Union and KISCO" in this notice). The Department received a consolidated response from these companies on November 17, 1997.

On October 30, 1997, we requested respondents to resubmit their data using purchase order/contract date, as opposed to invoice date, as date of sale for U.S. transactions. We received partially updated sales databases with