

*Consultation—Public Participation*

Water quality concerns in the South Chickamauga Creek Watershed were expressed by local citizens, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, other regional residents. NRCS personnel in partnership with interagency team members from the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and Environmental Protection Division (EPD) made a watershed assessment and evaluated existing water quality data. The team determined that agricultural related water quality problems were negatively affecting the watershed and the region's air, plant, animal, soil, and water resources. With these concerns identified, the team agreed that a holistic approach for assistance to operators based on the watershed approach would help solve the problems. The Sponsors requested NRCS planning assistance under PL-566 authority for a watershed protection plan.

At the initiation of the planning process, meetings were held with key farmers and District representatives from the watershed area to discuss problem identification, conservation systems and PL-566 requirements. A public meeting was held on June 29, 1999 to scope the problems and concerns and to explain impacts of the PL-566 program initiatives relative to a watershed project and discuss possible solutions. Notice of the meeting appeared in the local newspaper and on radio for several weeks prior to the date. Door to door verbal invitations were also made. One hundred eighty landowners, operators and interested citizens attended the meeting.

NRCS developed an interdisciplinary, interagency planning team to work with the Sponsor, landowners, and other interested groups. The team was compiled of specialists from NRCS, TVA, Ga. Cooperative Extension Service, EPD, along with local sponsors. The team worked in the watershed area and downstream to Nickajack Lake, to gain insight to the magnitude of the problems and possible solutions. Several meetings, group discussions, and interviews were held with local planners, individuals, government officials and other technical experts. Evaluations and alternative solutions were developed with the Sponsor and other officials. The Recommended Plan was agreed upon.

Another public meeting was held in Rocksprings, Georgia on March 21, 2000. Local operators, landowners and citizens attended the meeting. The results of surveys, studies, field

investigations and the Recommended Plan were presented. The Recommended Plan was agreed upon by those in attendance.

In April 2000, representatives of the NRCS, TVA, DNR, and other officials evaluated data to determine the quality and quantity of resources that would be impacted by selected practices and to consider possible mitigation measures. It was the consensus of the group that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was not needed for this project. This agreement was based on the type of practices and systems planned and that each would be installed on previously disturbed land. With this consensus, an Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared accordingly.

Upon review of the EA, this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was prepared. These documents are being distributed to all concerned agencies, groups, and interested individuals. A Notice of Availability of the FONSI is being published in the **Federal Register**.

Agency consolidations and public participation to date has shown no conflicts with the implementation of the selected plan.

*Conclusion*

The Environmental Assessment summarized above indicates that this Federal action will not cause significant adverse local, regional, or national impacts on the environment. Therefore, based on the above findings, I have determined that an environmental impact statement for the recommended South Chickamauga Creek Watershed Plan is not required.

Dated: July 10, 2000.

**Earl Cosby,**

*State Conservationist.*

[FR Doc. 00-17947 Filed 7-17-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-16-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****International Trade Administration**

[Docket No. A-580-809]

**Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea; Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the seventh 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, 1998, through October 31, 1999. This extension is made pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. We are also rescinding the review, in part, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 18, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Cynthia Thirumalai or Gregory Campbell, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4087 or 482-2239, 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 351, April 1999.

**Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results**

Due to the number of companies involved, the large number of transactions and the significance of outstanding issues, it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limit currently mandated (*i.e.*, August 1, 2000). Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results to not later than October 6, 2000.

**Partial Rescission of Review**

On November 30, 1999, Allied Tube and Conduit Corporation, Sawhill Tubular Division-Armco, Inc., and Wheatland Tube Company (the petitioners) requested a review of, inter alios, Korea Iron and Steel Company, Ltd (KISCO). As a result, an administrative review including KISCO was initiated on December 28, 1999, (*see, Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 64 FR 72644 (December 28, 1999)). KISCO did not separately request a review.

On June 15, 2000, the petitioners withdrew their request for a review of KISCO. Section 351.213(d)(1) of our regulations states that:

The Secretary will rescind an administrative review under this section, in whole or in part, if a party that requested a review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of the publication of notice of initiation of the requested review.

Section 351.213(d)(1) of our regulations further provides that we may extend that deadline, and it is our practice to do so, where it is reasonable, i.e., where the Department has not expended considerable time and resources, and where it does not appear that the procedures are being abused. *See, e.g., Fresh Kiwifruit From New Zealand: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review and Intent To Revoke Order, and Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 45508 45509 (August 20, 1999); *see also, Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27317 (May 19, 1997). In this review, the petitioners withdrew their request for review after the 90-day deadline. However, since the petitioners' withdrawal was made before the review had progressed beyond a point where it would be unreasonable to rescind, and because KISCO supports the petitioners' request for withdrawal, we find that rescinding the review with respect to KISCO would not prejudice any party to the proceeding and would, therefore, be reasonable. *See, e.g., Glycine From the People's Republic of China; Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 54406 56607 (October 22, 1998). Therefore, in accordance with section 351.213(d)(1) of our regulations, we have rescinded the review with respect to KISCO (*see, Memorandum to Susan Kuhbach of June 27, 2000 on Partial Rescission of Administrative Review*).

This notice is in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).

Dated: July 11, 2000.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 00-18121 Filed 7-17-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-533-813]

#### Certain Preserved Mushrooms from India: Notice of Rescission in Part of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a timely request from the petitioners<sup>1</sup>, on March 30, 2000, the Department of Commerce published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India with respect to Agro Dutch Foods, Ltd., Alpine Biotech, Ltd., Mandeep Mushrooms, Ltd., Hindustan Lever Limited (formerly Ponds India, Ltd.), Saptarishi Agro Industries, Ltd., Techtran Agro Industries, Ltd., Transchem, Ltd., Premier Mushroom Farms, Flex Foods, Ltd., Weikfield Agro Products, Ltd., Dinesh Agro Products, Ltd., and Himalya International, covering the period August 5, 1998, through January 31, 2000.

*See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 65 FR 16875 (March 30, 2000). On June 22, 2000, the petitioners timely withdrew their request for review of the following companies: Alpine Biotech, Ltd., Mandeep Mushrooms, Ltd., Saptarishi Agro Industries, Ltd., Transchem, Ltd., Premier Mushroom Farms, Flex Foods, Ltd., and Dinesh Agro Products, Ltd.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Department of Commerce is now rescinding this review, in part, as to the companies named above because the petitioners have withdrawn their request for review and no other interested parties have requested a review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 18, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

David J. Goldberger or Dinah McDougall, Import Administration,

<sup>1</sup> The petitioners are the Coalition for Fair Preserved Mushroom Trade which includes the American Mushroom Institute and the following domestic companies: L.K. Bowman, Inc., Nottingham, PA; Modern Mushrooms Farms, Inc., Toughkernamon, PA; Monterrey Mushrooms, Inc., Watsonville, CA; Mount Laurel Canning Corp., Temple, PA; Mushrooms Canning Company, Kennett Square, PA; Southwood Farms, Hockessin, DE; Sunny Dell Foods, Inc., Oxford, PA; United Canning Corp., North Lima, OH.

International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4136 or (202) 482-3773, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Applicable Statute**

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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1999).

**Background**

On February 14, 2000, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 7348) a notice of "Opportunity To Request Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India for the period August 5, 1998, through January 31, 2000. On February 29, 2000, the petitioners requested an administrative review of the above-referenced antidumping duty order for the period August 5, 1998, through January 31, 2000, for the following companies: Agro Dutch Foods, Ltd., Alpine Biotech, Ltd., Mandeep Mushrooms, Ltd., Hindustan Lever Limited (formerly Ponds India, Ltd.), Saptarishi Agro Industries, Ltd., Techtran Agro Industries, Ltd., Transchem, Ltd., Premier Mushroom Farms, Flex Foods, Ltd., Weikfield Agro Products, Ltd., Dinesh Agro Products, Ltd., and Himalya International. On March 30, 2000, the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India with respect to these companies (65 FR 16875).

**Rescission in Part of Review**

On June 22, 2000, the petitioners timely withdrew their request for review with respect to the following companies: Alpine Biotech, Ltd., Mandeep Mushrooms, Ltd., Saptarishi Agro Industries, Ltd., Transchem, Ltd., Premier Mushroom Farms, Flex Foods, Ltd., and Dinesh Agro Products, Ltd. Section 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations stipulates that the Secretary will permit a party that requests a review to withdraw the request within 90 days after the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review. In this case, the petitioners have withdrawn their request for review within the 90-day