

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

changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review and intent to revoke this order in part (62 FR 60470). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of this changed circumstances review. We received a comment from domestic producers and a rebuttal comment from Sudo.

*Comment:* Domestic producers claim that the Department's description of the merchandise to be excluded from the order is overly broad. They state that the Department, in its preliminary results, described the product to be excluded from the order only by width and thickness, ignoring the chemical composition and thickness of the coating. Domestic producers claim that their statement of no interest was based on a description of the product using all of the above criteria. Sudo agrees that the product to be excluded should be defined by all criteria.

*Department's Position:* We agree with domestic producers and with Sudo, and have added the chemical composition of each of the three coating layers and the thickness of the total coating to the characteristics of the product to be excluded from the antidumping order.

#### Scope of Review

The merchandise covered by this changed circumstances review is certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Japan. This changed circumstances administrative review covers all manufacturers/exporters of certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products meeting the following specifications: widths ranging from 10 millimeters (0.394 inches) through 100 millimeters (3.94 inches); thicknesses, including coatings, ranging from 0.11 millimeters (0.004 inches) through 0.60 millimeters (0.024 inches); and a coating that is from 0.003 millimeters (0.00012 inches) through 0.005 millimeters (0.000196 inches) in thickness and that is comprised of three evenly applied layers, the first layer consisting of 99% zinc, 0.5% cobalt, and 0.5% molybdenum, followed by a layer consisting of chromate, and finally a layer consisting of silicate.

#### Final Results of Review; Partial Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order

The affirmative statement of no interest by petitioners in certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products, as described above, produced in Japan, constitutes changed circumstances sufficient to warrant partial revocation of this order. Therefore, the Department is partially revoking the order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from

Japan with regard to products which meet the specifications detailed above, in accordance with sections 751 (b) and (d) and 782(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216(d)(1). This partial revocation applies to all entries of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after October 27, 1995.

The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to proceed with liquidation, without regard to antidumping duties, of all unliquidated entries of certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products with the dimensions and coatings described above from Japan, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after October 27, 1995. The Department will further instruct Customs to refund with interest any estimated duties collected with respect to unliquidated entries of this product from Japan entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after October 27, 1995, in accordance with section 778 of the Act.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protection orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d)(1997). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This changed circumstances administrative review, partial revocation of the antidumping duty order and notice are in accordance with sections 751 (b) and (d) and 782(h) of the Act and sections 351.216 and 351.222(g) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: December 16, 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**  
*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-33351 Filed 12-19-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-428-824, A-475-820, A-588-843, A-580-829, A-469-807, A-401-806, and A-583-828]

#### Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, Spain, Sweden, and Taiwan

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

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Irene Darzenta, James Maeder, or Erik Warga, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-6320, (202) 482-3330, or (202) 482-0922, respectively.

#### Postponement of Preliminary Determinations

On August 19, 1997, the Department initiated antidumping duty investigations of imports of stainless steel wire rod from Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, Spain, Sweden, and Taiwan. The notice of initiation stated that we would issue our preliminary determinations on or before January 6, 1998 (62 FR 45224, August 26, 1997).

On December 11, 1997, petitioners made a timely request pursuant to 19 CFR 351.205(e) of the Department's regulations for 50-day postponements of the preliminary determinations, until February 25, 1998, pursuant to section 733(c)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Petitioners requested postponements because the Department is either (a) in the process of conducting below-cost investigations (in the Spain and Taiwan cases) or (b) evaluating petitioners' requests to initiate below-cost investigations (in the Italy, Japan, Korea and Sweden investigations), and it is the petitioners' intention that, by requesting postponements, the additional time will allow the Department to include data from any cost investigations in its preliminary determinations.

In the investigation of stainless steel wire rod from Germany, the respondents have informed the Department that they are not cooperating in the investigation; as a result, the Department will have no choice but to use the most adverse facts available in its determination. Although no additional time is likely to be needed for the Department to prepare its preliminary determination in the Germany investigation, petitioners are