vegetation management without commercial harvest.

People may visit with the Forest Service officials at any time during the analysis and prior to the decision. Two periods are specifically designated for comments on the analysis: (1) During the scoping process and (2) during the draft EIS comment period.

During the scoping process, the Forest Service is seeking additional information and comments from Federal, Tribal, State, and local agencies and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in or affected by the proposed action. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service will be consulted concerning any effects to threatened and endangered species. The agency invites written comments and suggestions on this action, particularly in terms of identification of issues and alternative development.

The draft environmental impact statement is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and made available for public review in February of 2000. The final environmental impact statement is expected to be completed in May 2000. 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 an 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 Agoon* 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 related to 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. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act as 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 1, 1999.

David J. Wright,

Forest Supervisor, Idaho Panhandle National Forests.

[FR Doc. 99–31603 Filed 12–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Utilities Service

East Kentucky Power Cooperative; Notice of 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 from East Kentucky Power Cooperative for financing assistance from the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) to finance the construction of the J.K. Smith Unit #4 Combustion Turbine to be located in Clark County, Kentucky.

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 J.K. Smith Unit #4 Combustion Turbine will be installed adjacent to three existing combustion turbines located at East Kentucky Power Cooperative's J.K. Smith Combustion Turbine Site located in a rural area approximately 9 miles southeast of Winchester, Kentucky, on Kentucky Highway 89. The combustion turbine will be fired by natural gas or #2 fuel oil. Natural gas and fuel oil will be supplied by an existing natural gas pipeline and fuel oil storage facilities on site. The electric output from the combustion turbine will be feed to the electric transmission grid via the existing J.K. Smith Substation. No additional electric transmission lines are needed at this time to operate the additional combustion turbine.

Copies of the FONSI are available from RUS at the address provided herein or from Jeff Hohman, East Kentucky Power Cooperative, PO Box 707, Winchester, Kentucky 40391, telephone (606) 744–4812.

Dated: November 24, 1999.

Blaine D. Stockton, Jr.,

Assistant Administrator, Electric Program, Rural Utilities Service.

[FR Doc. 99–31366 Filed 12–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–412–810]

Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products from the United Kingdom: 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.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom in response to requests by the respondent, British Steel Engineering Steels Limited, and the petitioners, Ispat Inland Inc. and USS/KOBE Steel Co.

This review covers the period March 1, 1998, through February 28, 1999.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 7, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rebecca Trainor or David J. Goldberger, Office 2, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Import Administration, Room B099, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4007, or 482–4136, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to 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 are to the regulations at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Background

On March 22, 1993, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom (58 FR 15324).

On March 9, 1999, we published in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 11439) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom covering the period March 1, 1998, through February 28, 1999.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), both British Steel Engineering Steels Limited (BSES) and the petitioners requested that we conduct this administrative review. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on April 22, 1999 (64 FR 23269).

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review are hot-rolled bars and rods of nonalloy or other alloy steel, whether or not descaled, containing by weight 0.03 percent or more of lead or 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, in coils or cut lengths, and in numerous shapes and sizes. Excluded from the scope of this review are other alloy steels (as defined by the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) Chapter 72, note 1 (f)), except steels classified as other alloy steels by reason of containing by weight 0.4 percent or more of lead, or 0.1 percent or more of bismuth, tellurium, or selenium. Also excluded are semi-finished steels and flat-rolled products. Most of the products covered in this review are provided for under subheadings 7213.20.00.00 and 7214.30.00.00 of the HTSUS. Small quantities of these products may also enter the United States under the following HTSUS subheadings: 7213.31.30.00; 7213.31.60.00; 7213.39.00.30; 7213.39.00.60; 7213.39.00.90; 7213.91.30.00; 7213.91.45.00; 7213.91.60.00; 7213.99.00; 7214.40.00.10, 7214.40.00.30, 7214.40.00.50; 7214.50.00.10; 7214.50.00.30, 7214.50.00.50; 7214.60.00.10; 7214.60.00.30; 7214.60.00.50; 7214.91.00; 7214.99.00; 7228.30.80.00; and 7228.30.80.50. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Normal Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of the subject merchandise by BSES to the United States were made at less than normal value (NV), we compared export price (EP) to the NV, as described in the ''Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice.

Pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the EPs of individual U.S. transactions to the monthly weighted-average NV of the foreign like product where there were sales made at prices above the cost of production (COP), as discussed in the ''Cost of Production Analysis'' section, below, and where these sales were otherwise in the ordinary course of trade.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products produced by BSES covered by the description in the ''Scope of the Review'' section, above, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. We compared U.S. sales to sales made in the home market within the contemporaneous window period, which extends from three months prior to the U.S. sale until two months after the sale. *See* 19 CFR 351.414(e)(2). Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the most similar foreign like product sold in the ordinary course of trade. In making the product comparisons, we matched foreign like products based on the physical characteristics identified in the June 10, 1999, questionnaire in the following order: chemical composition, shape, cut (*i.e.*, coil or cut-to-length), size range, and grade.

We have accepted the additional product characteristic variations reported by BSES for chemical composition, shape, and cut, as these characteristics have been used for model matching in previous administrative reviews of BSES' sales. We have not modified the size range groups from those specified in the questionnaire, as requested by BSES in its September 24, 1999, letter, because there is no basis on the record to support BSES' claim that this modification reflects a ''generally accepted dividing line between rod and bar.''

Consistent with our practice (*see, e.g., Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Netherlands,* 61 FR 48465, 48466, September 13, 1996), we compared prime quality product sold in the United States to identical prime quality product sold in the home market. Where there were no home market sales of identical prime quality product sold in the ordinary course of trade, we compared the U.S. sales of prime quality product to the most similar prime quality foreign like product sold in the ordinary course of trade, based on the characteristics listed above. There were no U.S. sales of second quality product during the period of review (POR), March 1, 1998, through February 28, 1999.

Export Price

We based United States price on EP, as defined in section 772(a) of the Act, because the merchandise was sold directly by the exporter to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of importation and constructed export price was not otherwise indicated by the facts of record. When sales are made prior to importation through an affiliated or unaffiliated U.S. sales agent to an unaffiliated customer in the United States, our practice is to examine several criteria in order to determine whether the sales are EP sales. Those criteria are: (1) whether the merchandise was shipped directly from the

manufacturer to the unaffiliated U.S. customer; (2) whether this was the customary commercial channel between the parties involved; and (3) whether the function of the U.S. selling agent was limited to that of a ''processor of sales-related documentation'' and a ''communications link'' with the unaffiliated U.S. buyer. Where all three criteria are met, indicating that the activities of the U.S. selling agent are ancillary to the sale, the Department has determined the sales to be EP sales (*see, e.g., Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Italy,* 63 FR 40422, 40424–25, July 29, 1998). In the instant review, the merchandise was shipped directly from the manufacturer to the unaffiliated U.S. customer and this was the customary channel between the parties involved. The role of BSES' U.S. subsidiary was limited only to providing marketing support and referring customer inquiries to the parent company. Thus, the above-referenced criteria have been met, and we have treated all U.S. sales as EP sales.

We calculated EP based on packed, delivered prices to customers in the United States. We made deductions, where applicable, for foreign inland freight, FOB charges in the United Kingdom, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. customs duties, brokerage and handling charges, merchandise processing fees, and U.S. inland freight charges, in accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act. We also made adjustments for invoice corrections.

Normal Value

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, the Department compared BSES's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to its volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with sections 773(a)(1) (B) and (C) of the Act. Because BSES' aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market provides a viable basis for calculating NV. *See also* 19 CFR 351.404(b).

Many of BSES' home market sales were made to affiliated original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) and resellers. With respect to affiliated resellers, BSES reported the sales made by the affiliated reseller to the unaffiliated customer, in accordance with the requirements of the Department's questionnaire. It is the Department's practice, in situations where home market sales are made to affiliated parties, to determine whether it is appropriate to use such sales as the basis of NV by comparing the prices of those sales to the prices of sales to unaffiliated parties, on a model-by-model basis (*see, e.g., Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Orders; Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et al.,* 60 FR 10899, 10900, February 28, 1995; and 19 CFR 351.403(c)). With respect to BSES' home market sales to affiliated OEMs during the POR, we tested these sales to ensure that, on average, the affiliated-party sales were made at arm's length. To conduct this test, we compared the weighted-average gross unit prices of sales to affiliated and unaffiliated customers at the same level of trade (LOT), where possible, net of all movement charges, direct selling expenses, invoice corrections, rebates, and packing. As a result of our arm's-length test, we disregarded sales to the affiliated customers in the home market where the prices charged to an affiliated customer were on average less than 99.5 percent of the prices charged to unaffiliated customers (*see, e.g., Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Thailand* 62 FR 53809, 53817, October 16, 1997).

We did not require BSES to provide downstream sales by the affiliated OEM customers because these customers further manufactured the subject merchandise into merchandise not covered by the order. With respect to downstream sales by the affiliated resellers, we used them in our determination of NV, where appropriate, because BSES' sales to its affiliated customers accounted for more than five percent of BSES' total sales in its home market (*see* 19 CFR 351.403(d)).

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we based NV on sales at the same LOT as the EP sale. If NV was calculated at a different LOT, we made an adjustment, in accordance with section 773(a)(7) of the Act (*see* ''Level of Trade'' section below).

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same LOT as the EP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit. For EP, the LOT is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from the exporter to an unaffiliated U.S. customer. To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP sales, we examined stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison-market sales are at a different LOT and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act.

To determine whether different LOTs exist, we examined the respondent's distribution systems, including selling functions, classes of customers, and selling expenses. BSES reported two channels of distribution in the home market: (1) sales produced to order and shipped from the mill directly to unaffiliated OEMs (Channel 1 sales); and (2) sales by affiliated resellers to unaffiliated OEMs (Channel 2 sales). In analyzing the information submitted, we found that the two home market channels differ with respect to selling activities. Channel 2 sales involved additional selling activities including: maintenance of inventory; small lot sales; cutting into short lengths; and rebundling into smaller weight bundles. None of these activities is typical of mill direct sales to Channel 1 customers. Further, we found that these channels constitute different stages in the marketing process. Based on this analysis, we find that the two home market channels of distribution comprise two LOTs.

BSES reported EP sales in the U.S. market, which were made to order by BSES, and shipped directly to unaffiliated OEMs in the United States. We found that EP sales involved the same selling functions and therefore were sold at the same marketing stage as BSES' home market Channel 1 sales, described above. Therefore, we have determined that the LOT for all EP sales is the same as Channel 1 in the home market. Accordingly, we have compared the U.S. sales to sales at the same LOT in the home market when possible. If we found no contemporaneous home market Channel 1 sales of the identical or most similar product, we matched the

EP sale to home market Channel 2 sales of that product. Because we compared sales at different LOTs in some instances, we examined whether a LOT adjustment was appropriate. Based on our analysis, we determined that there was a pattern of consistent price differences between the Channel 1 and Channel 2 LOTs in the home market. Therefore, when we compared sales at different LOTs, we made an adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. (*See* Memorandum to the File from The Team dated December 1, 1999, for further explanation.)

Cost of Production Analysis

Pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act, for this POR, we initiated an investigation of sales at less than the COP. We did so because, in the final results of the most recent administrative review of BSES, we determined that BSES made home market sales that were below the COP and were consequently disregarded (*see Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products from the United Kingdom,* 64 FR 43673, August 11, 1999). Therefore, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, we had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that BSES made sales at less than the COP during this review period. Before making any NV comparisons, we conducted the COP analysis described below.

A. Calculation of COP

Pursuant to section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the COP based on the sum of BSES' cost of materials and fabrication employed in producing the foreign like product, plus amounts for home market general and administrative expenses. We relied on the home market sales and COP information provided by BSES in its questionnaire response.

B. Test of Home Market Prices

After calculating COP, we tested whether home market sales of hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel were made at prices below the COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such prices permitted recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. We compared the model-specific COP to the reported home market prices less any applicable invoice corrections, movement charges, rebates, direct and indirect selling expenses, and packing costs.

C. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of the respondent's sales of a specific model were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in ''substantial quantities.'' Where 20 percent or more of the respondent's sales of a specific model during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because we determined that the below-cost sales were made within an extended period of time in ''substantial quantities'' in accordance with sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act, and because, based on our comparisons of prices to weighted-average COPs for the POR, we determined that the below-cost sales of the product were at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, as defined in section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Based on this test, we disregarded certain below-cost home market sales made by BSES.

Comparisons

Pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the EPs of individual transactions to the monthly weighted-average price of sales of the foreign like product where there were sales at prices above COP, as discussed above. We based NV on packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the home market, and to affiliated purchasers in the home market to the extent that prices were at arm's length. We made adjustments to home market price, where applicable, in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act, for invoice corrections, rebates, and inland freight. We also made circumstance-of-sale adjustments for differences in credit, credit insurance and warranty expenses pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. In order to adjust for differences in packing between the two markets, we increased home market price by the amount of U.S. packing costs and reduced it by the amount of home market packing costs, pursuant to 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act. We made adjustments, where appropriate, for physical differences in merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act, and for differences in LOT, in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of our comparison of EP and NV, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin (percent)
British Steel Engineering Steels Limited (BSES) (formerly United Engineering Steels Limited)	3/1/98–2/28/99	3.01

We will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties to this proceeding within five days of the publication date of this notice. *See* 19 CFR 351.224(b). Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication or the first business day thereafter.

Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in the respective case briefs and rebuttal briefs. Case briefs from interested parties and rebuttal briefs, limited to the issues raised in the respective case briefs, may be submitted not later than 30 days and 35 days, respectively, from the date of publication of these preliminary results (*see* 19 CFR 351.309(c) and (d)). Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Parties are also encouraged to provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations and cases cited.

The Department will subsequently issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs or at the hearing, if held, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Room B–099, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of issues to be discussed (*see* 19 CFR 351.310(c)).

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess,

antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appropriate appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service upon completion of this review. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by this review and for future deposits of estimated duties. We will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review if any importer-specific assessment rate calculated in the final results of this review is above *de minimis.* For assessment purposes, we intend to calculate importer-specific assessment rates for the subject merchandise by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales examined and dividing this amount by the total quantity sold.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be that established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent, and therefore, *de minimis* within the meaning of 351.106(c)(1), in which case the cash deposit rate will be zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 25.82 percent, the ''All Others'' rate made effective by the LTFV investigation. These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 1, 1999.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–31674 Filed 12–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–475–818]

Certain Pasta from Italy: Extension of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 7, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Brinkmann at (202) 482–4126, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement II, Group VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

TIME LIMITS

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary determination is published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within the time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend these deadlines to a maximum of 365 days and 180 days, respectively.

Background

On August 27, 1998, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy, covering the period July 1, 1997 to June 30, 1998 (63 FR 45796). On August 9, 1999, we issued the preliminary results of review (64 FR 43152). In our notice of preliminary results, we stated our intention to issue the final results of this review no later than December 7,1999.

Extension of Final Results of Review

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the final results of this review within the original time limit. Therefore, the Department is extending the time limits for completion of the final results until no later than February 7, 2000. *See* Decision Memorandum from Holly Kuga to Richard W. Moreland, dated November 29, 1999, which is on file in the Central Records Unit.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: November 30, 1999.

Holly Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary Import Administration, Group II.

[FR Doc. 99–31672 Filed 12–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–823–805]

Suspension Agreement on Silicomanganese From Ukraine; Notice of Rescission of Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of rescission of administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from petitioner and the Government of Ukraine, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated an administrative review of the suspension agreement on silicomanganese from Ukraine on December 23, 1998. The Department received requests for withdrawal on November 30, 1999, from petitioner and the Government of Ukraine. This review has now been rescinded as a result of the withdrawal of the requests for review by petitioner and the Government of Ukraine, the only parties which requested the review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 7, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carrie Blozy or Rick Johnson, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230;