

**TYPE OF MEETING:** Open to the public. Persons may participate in the meeting if time and space permit.

**COMMENTS:** The public may file written comments before or after the meeting by contacting the person below.

**PURPOSE:** The Council agenda will include: Discussion of implications of new Research and Education Title of Farm Bill; Government Performance and Results Act; science planning as it relates to forestry and natural resources; review of the Cooperative Forestry Research Program (McIntire-Stennis); and other current research issues.

**FOR INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Ralph A. Otto, Natural Resources and Environment, Aerospace Center, Suite 816, Stop 2210, Washington, D.C. 20250-2210; Telephone (202) 401-4555.

Done at Washington, DC, this 16th day of December 1997.

**Colien Hefferan,**

*Associate Administrator, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.*

[FR Doc. 97-33339 Filed 12-19-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-22-P

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### North Fork St. Joe River Project; Idaho Panhandle National Forests, Shoshone County, Idaho

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

**SUMMARY:** The St. Joe Ranger District of the Idaho Panhandle National Forest, USDA Forest Service will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to disclose the environmental effects of vegetation, road and trail, and watershed restoration activities on National Forest lands within the North Fork St. Joe River drainage. The project area is located immediately north of the town of Avery, Idaho. Based on an interdisciplinary assessment of resource conditions within the area, the purpose and need for this proposal is summarized as:

1. Maintain or improve long term water quality within the project area. Where water quality is currently limited, work towards restoring properly functioning hydrologic condition.
2. Maintain or improve habitat for native fish.
3. Maintain or develop habitat conditions (including forest structure, habitat connectivity, security habitat and limited road densities) to contribute to the conservation of forest dwelling species.
4. Forest structure: Where conditions

permit, maintain or begin restoration of large diameter trees and forest structures once more common within the North Fork St. Joe area. 5. Forest composition: Where conditions permit, maintain or begin restoration of large, potentially long lived seral species (western white pine, western larch, ponderosa pine, white bark pine) which once dominated the forested landscape of the St. Joe River basin. 6. Promote fire use and control strategies for safety and efficiency of suppression and protection and maintenance of resource values. Trend toward allowing fire to play its natural role as a forest disturbance mechanism. Reduce the risk of very large stand replacing fires through vegetation management and restore beneficial fire effects. 7. Maintain or improve the unique and diverse recreational opportunities available within the area. Provide dispersed and developed campsites for the increasing recreational use. Mitigate, where feasible and necessary, effects of the increasing recreational use and supporting infrastructure (trails, campsites, access routes) on other resource values. 8. Reduce the risk of blending genetic material from the poorly adapted, non-local ponderosa pine trees planted earlier this century with that of the native ponderosa pine. Replace the poorly adapted trees with more sustainable native species. 9. Timber harvest, when feasible and cost effective, will be used when it can help achieve the other landscape objectives so as to also contribute wood to the local timber supply. In as much as it is compatible with other objectives, harvest activities will maintain or improve the long term growth and production of commercially valuable wood products from the sites.

**DATES:** Comments should be postmarked on or before January 21, 1998. Please include your name and address and the name of the project you are commenting on.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit written comments and suggestions on the proposed management activities or requests to be placed on project mailing list to Brad Gilbert, District Ranger, St. Joe Ranger District, P.O. Box 407, St. Maries, ID 83861. Brad Gilbert is the Responsible Official.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Pete Zimmerman, Project Team Leader, St. Joe Ranger District, (208) 245-2531.

Comments received in response to this solicitation, including names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposed action and will be available for public inspection.

Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered; however, those who submit anonymous comments will not have standing to appeal the subsequent decision under 36 CFR parts 215 or 217. Additionally, pursuant to 7 CFR 1.27(d), any person may request the agency to withhold a submission from the public record by showing how the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) permits such confidentiality. Persons requesting such confidentiality may be granted in only very limited circumstances, such as to protect trade secrets. The Forest Service will inform the requester of the agency's decision regarding the request for confidentiality, and where the request is denied, the agency will return the submission and notify the requester that the comments may be resubmitted with or without name and address within 10 days.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The decision area contains approximately 75,000 acres within the Idaho Panhandle National Forests in Shoshone County, Idaho. All the proposed projects would occur on National Forest lands in the N. Fork St. Joe River drainage immediately north of Avery, Idaho. The legal location of the decision area is as follows: all or portions of

Township 45 North, Range 5 East; Township 45 North, Range 6 East; Township 46 North, Range 5 East; Township 46 North, Range 6 East; Township 46 North, Range 7 East; Township 47 North, Range 5 East; Township 47 North, Range 6 East; Township 47 North, Range 7 East;

The proposed action is designed to achieve the purpose and need for action as described above. The proposed activities would be initiated over the next ten years. While many of the proposed management activities may work towards achieving more than one of the project objectives, they have been grouped here into four basic categories to simplify the description.

#### Vegetation

The St. Joe District proposes to use prescribed fire, timber harvest, planting, and other methods to achieve the desired vegetation conditions described above in the purpose and need. Proposed individual treatments by method are as follows (please note that acreage values are gross and would generally include 10 to 25 percent untreated area within the gross area).

Prescribed burning would be the primary treatment on approximately 3,420 acres. (1) Approximately 310 acres of decadent shrubfields within primary big game winter range would be burned to stimulate fresh browse production.

(2) Approximately 2720 acres would be burned to reintroduce the beneficial effects of fire into this ecosystem, reduce fuel loads, and create fuel breaks to reduce the risk of larger, more destructive conflagrations within the landscape. About 1,140 of these acres consist of decadent shrubfields outside of primary big game winter range. Another 740 acres consist of subalpine balds along the northern divide where conifers have begun encroaching after seventy plus years of successful fire suppression. The remaining 840 acres consist of lodge-pole pine stands within the unroaded portions of the North Fork St. Joe River landscape. (3) Approximately 270 acres of poorly adapted ponderosa pine planted early in this century would be burned to kill these "off-site" trees. The purpose is to prevent these trees from cross pollinating with the native ponderosa pine (genetic contamination). These acres would be replanted with better adapted local stock of ponderosa pine, western white pine, and/or western larch. An additional 970 acres of similar non-local ponderosa pine would be treated in this manner if the trees prove uneconomical to harvest prior to burning (see harvest of non-local ponderosa pine below). (4) Approximately 34 acres in and around white bark pine stands would be burned and/or treated mechanically to limit encroachment by other tree species and facilitate natural and planted regeneration.

Timber harvest, in combination with prescribed fire and tree planting, would be the primary treatment on approximately 2,580 acres. (1) Regeneration harvest treatments (harvest methods designed to establish a new stand of more desirable tree species) would occur on approximately 2,030 acres. Prescribed fire would be used to reduce fuels and prepare the sites for planting. About 1,060 of these acres consist primarily of lodgepole pine, a short lived seral tree specie. The remaining 970 acres consist of poorly adapted ponderosa pine planted early in this century. The purpose of removing these ponderosa pine is to prevent these trees from cross pollinating with the better adapted native ponderosa pine (genetic contamination). As noted above, if any or all of these "off-site" ponderosa pine stands prove uneconomical to harvest (they occur primarily in unroaded areas and would require the more expensive helicopter logging) they would still be burned to kill the trees prior to planting to better adapted species.

(2) Commercial thinning (harvesting excess and less desirable trees from a

stand to provide more growing room for the remaining trees) would occur on approximately 550 acres.

#### Access

The St. Joe District proposes to manage the transportation network (roads and trails) in the following ways: (1) Maintain existing access (motorized and non-motorized) on approximately 145 miles of road and 72 miles of trail within the area. (2) Approximately 5.7 miles of new road would be constructed to provide access for timber harvest activities noted above. All but 0.3 miles of these new roads would be either obliterated or stabilized for long term storage following use. The 0.3 miles that would be kept drivable would provide new access for an existing mining claim, thereby allowing obliteration of an additional mile of existing road currently accessing the claim. (3) Approximately 36 miles of existing road would be either obliterated or stabilized for long term storage. (4) Approximately 1 mile of new trail would be constructed to replace trail access currently served by one of these roads which are proposed to be obliterated.

#### Recreation

The St. Joe District proposes to make improvements to several campsites as follows: (1) Additional campsites and facilities would be constructed at the Squaw Creek Campground. (2) Several dispersed camp sites would be hardened within the Loop Creek meadows and toilet facilities added to protect adjacent resources.

#### Aquatic Restoration

The St. Joe District proposes the following aquatic restoration activities in addition to those identified above (e.g. road stabilization, etc.). (1) Complete exploratory core drilling on three old railroad grade through-fills to determine and evaluate their condition and structural integrity. Based on the results, develop an action plan to mitigate potential risks. (2) Plant trees within 140 acres of riparian areas adjacent to the North Fork St. Joe River and Clear Creek. (3) Develop and implement a stream restoration plan for Loop Creek downstream from the mouth of Moss Creek. (4) Construct baffles to facilitate fish passage through the Loop Creek water bypass tunnel.

#### Preliminary Issues

We expect issues and concerns with this project to include the effects on wildlife, fish, water quality, roadless, visual quality/aesthetics and recreation as well as the effects of road construction, clearcutting, size of

openings, and economic feasibility. Final issues will be developed and analyzed based on your comments and the interdisciplinary team's analysis of potential effects of the proposed action on the various resource values. These issues will be used to develop alternatives to the proposed action and guide the type and detail of analysis conducted.

Additionally, some of the vegetation treatment may result in openings of over 60 acres. While we would like comments that would affect alternatives early, comments on the size of openings and their effects will be accepted for 60 days after publication of this notice. This 60 day public review period and approval of the Regional Forester for exceeding the 40 acre limitation for regeneration harvest would be required prior to the signing of the Record of Decision.

The Forest Service will consider a range of alternatives to this proposed action. One of these will be the "No Action" alternative. Additional alternatives will examine varying levels and locations for the proposed activities to achieve the proposal's purpose, as well as to respond to the issues and other resource values.

Public participation is an important part of the analysis and will play an important role in developing the alternatives. The mailing list for public scoping will be developed from responses to this NOI and responses to the Forest's "Quarterly Schedule of Proposed Actions." In addition, the public is encouraged to visit with Forest Service officials during the analysis and prior to the decision. The Forest Service will also be seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, and local agencies and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in or affected by the proposed actions. Comments from the public and other agencies will be used in preparation of the Draft EIS.

The draft environmental impact statement is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and available for public review in March 1998. The final environmental impact statement is expected to be completed in May 1998.

The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 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. First,

reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts the agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 533 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental statement stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental statement may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45-day comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concern on the proposed 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. Reviews may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in its programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, and marital or familial status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication of program information (braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint, write the Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250, or call 1-800-245-6340 (voice) or 202-720-1127 (TDD). USDA is an equal employment opportunity employer.

Dated: December 11, 1997.

**Bradley Burmark,**

*Deputy District Ranger.*

[FR Doc. 97-33346 Filed 12-19-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

#### Posting of Stockyards

Pursuant to the authority provided under Section 302 of the Packers and Stockyards Act (7 U.S.C. 202), it was ascertained that the livestock market named below is a stockyard as defined by Section 302 (a). Notice was given to the stockyard owner and to the public as required by Section 302 (b), by posting notices at the stockyard on the date specified below, that the stockyard is subject to the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U.S.C. 181 *et seq.*).

Facility No., name, and location of stockyard	Date of posting
PA-159, Troy Sales, Troy, Pennsylvania.	September 17, 1997.

Done at Washington, D.C. this 12th day of December 1997.

**Daniel L. Van Ackeren,**

*Director, Livestock Marketing Division, Packers and Stockyards Programs.*

[FR Doc. 97-33331 Filed 12-19-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-EN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-588-824]

#### Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Japan: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review, and revocation in part of antidumping duty order.

**SUMMARY:** On November 10, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of initiation of a changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review and preliminary results of review with intent to revoke, in part, the

antidumping duty order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Japan. We are now revoking this order in part, with respect to corrosion-resistant steel flat products with certain dimensions and coatings, based on the fact that domestic parties have expressed no interest in the importation or sale of this product, imported from Japan.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 22, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Gideon Katz or Maureen Flannery, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-5255 and (202) 482-3020, 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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as codified at 19 CFR by Part 351, 62 FR 27295 (May 19, 1997).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On September 19, 1997, Sudo Corporation (Sudo) requested that the Department conduct a changed circumstances administrative review to determine whether to partially revoke the order with regard to imports of certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Japan. The order with regard to imports of other types of corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products is not affected by this request. On October 28, 1997, domestic producers AK Steel Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Inland Steel Industries, Inc., LTV Steel Company, Inc., National Steel Corporation, and U.S. Steel Group, a unit of USX Corporation, informed the Department in writing that they did not object to the changed circumstances review and had no interest in the importation or sale of electrolytic zinc-coated steel coiled rolls produced in Japan as described in detail in Sudo's letter.

We preliminarily determined that domestic producers' affirmative statement of no interest constituted changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a partial revocation of this order. Consequently, on November 10, 1997, the Department published a notice of initiation and preliminary results of