

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A scoping notice for the preparation of an Environmental Assessment was published in the **Federal Register**, on September 11, 2001, Vol. 66, No. 176, page 47161. The notice described the land areas involved, background information, purpose and need, proposed action, decision framework, responsible officials, public involvement, preliminary issues, and estimated dates for filing the environmental document, as well as the reviewer's obligation to comment.

The notice stated that the scoping process would be used to evaluate whether or not an EIS is warranted. It further stated, "If an EIS is warranted then written comments resulting from this notice will be used to determine the scope of alternatives and effects in the EIS."

Based on the level of interest expressed during scoping, the Responsible Officials have decided to prepare an EIS. The comments received during the scoping process for the Environmental Assessment will be used in preparation of the EIS; therefore scoping will not be reinitiated. Several alternatives will be considered in the EIS, including the no action alternative. The action alternatives are designed to accomplish the purpose and need as stated in the September 11, 2002, **Federal Register** scoping notice: "To establish management direction that conserves and promotes recovery of the Canada lynx by reducing or eliminating adverse effects from land management activities on these national forests and BLM lands, while preserving the overall multiple-use direction in existing plans," and "to achieve the stated purpose, the selected amendment must provide a level of lynx conservation and recovery comparable to the Lynx Conservation Assessment Strategy." The primary issues include: the agencies' ability to adapt management to new information; scale to which some standards apply; limits on precommercial thinning; limit of salvage less than five acres; effect on winter recreation special use permits and agreements from requiring no-net-increase of groomed or designated routes; and the effect of road guidelines on upgrading of the transportation system. Written comments on the range of alternatives and their effects will be requested and considered when the Draft EIS is released.

The national forests and BLM units and their associated plans included in this amendment are shown below. The **Federal Register** notice prepared for scoping said that 18 land and resource management plans for national forests

in Idaho, Montana, Utah and Wyoming, and 18 BLM land use plans in Idaho and Utah would be amended. This notice corrects that information. There are 20 land and resource management plans that would be amended on 18 National Forests and 9 BLM land use plans that would be amended on 9 BLM Field Offices. Some of the forests have been consolidated, but retain the plans for the original forest. The number of BLM plans has been modified based on additional review of lynx habitat on BLM lands.

#### NATIONAL FORESTS AND ASSOCIATED LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS

Region 1:	
Bitterroot .....	Bitterroot Forest Plan
Beaverhead-Deerlodge.	Beaverhead Forest Plan, Deerlodge Forest Plan
Clearwater .....	Clearwater Forest Plan
Custer .....	Custer Forest Plan
Flathead .....	Flathead Forest Plan
Gallatin .....	Gallatin Forest Plan
Helena .....	Helena Forest Plan
Idaho Panhandle.	Idaho Panhandle Forest Plan
Kootenai .....	Kootenai Forest Plan
Lewis and Clark.	Lewis and Clark Forest Plan
Lolo .....	Lolo Forest Plan
Nez Perce .....	Nez Perce Forest Plan
Region 2:	
Bighorn .....	Bighorn Forest Plan
Shoshone .....	Shoshone Forest Plan
Region 4:	
Ashley .....	Ashley Forest Plan
Bridger-Teton	Bridger-Teton Forest Plan
Salmon-Challis	Salmon Forest Plan, Challis Forest Plan
Caribou-Targhee.	Targhee Forest Plan

#### BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT OFFICES AND ASSOCIATED LAND USE PLANS

Idaho	
Upper Columbia-Salmon/Clearwater District: Salmon Field Office.	Lemhi Resource Management Plan (RMP) Challis RMP
Challis Field Office.	Emerald Empire Management Framework Plan (MFP)
Coeur d'Alene Field Office.	Chief Joseph MFP
Cottonwood Field Office.	
Upper Snake River District: Idaho Falls Field Office.	Medicine Lodge RMP
Pocatello Field Office.	Pocatello RMP*
Shoshone Field Office.	Sun Valley MFP

#### BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT OFFICES AND ASSOCIATED LAND USE PLANS—Continued

Lower Snake River District: Four Rivers Field Office.	Cascade RMP
<b>Utah</b>	
Salt Lake City Field Office.	Randolph MFP

\*Only the linkage area direction would apply.

Dated: June 17, 2002.

**Kathleen A. McAllister,**  
*Deputy Regional Forester.*

Dated: June 19, 2002.

**Fritz Rennebaum,**  
*Acting Associate Idaho State Director.*  
[FR Doc. 02-20719 Filed 8-14-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### International Trade Administration [A-351-605]

##### Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice from Brazil; Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Rescission of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review for the Period May 1, 2001, through April 30, 2002.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 15, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Irina Itkin or Elizabeth Eastwood, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-0656 or (202) 482-3874, respectively.

##### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### The 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 (the Department)'s regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (2002).

## Background

On May 6, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 30356) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order regarding frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil for the period May 1, 2001, through April 30, 2002.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), on May 31, 2002, the domestic interested parties of Florida Citrus Mutual, Citrus Belle, Citrus World, Inc., Orange-Co of Florida, Inc., Peace River Citrus Products, Inc., and Southern Gardens Citrus Processors Corp. requested a review of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil with respect to the following producers/exporters: Citrovita Agro Industrial Ltda. and its affiliated parties Cambuhy MC Industrial Ltda. and Cambuhy Citrus Comercial e Exportadora (collectively "Citravita"), Branco Peres Citrus S.A. (Branco Peres), CTM Citrus S.A. (CTM), and Sucorrico S.A. (Sucorrico).

In June 2002, the Department initiated an administrative review for Citrovita, Branco Peres, CTM, and Sucorrico (67 FR 42753 (June 25, 2002)) and issued questionnaires to them.

In July and August 2002, Branco Peres, CTM, Citrovita, and Sucorrico notified the Department that neither they nor any of their affiliates had any sales or exports of subject merchandise during the period of review (POR). The Department has been able to confirm with the Customs Service that Branco Peres, CTM, Citrovita, and Sucorrico had no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. See the August 5, 2002, memorandum from Elizabeth Eastwood to the file entitled "Intent to Rescind the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review on Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice from Brazil."

## Rescission of Review

As Branco Peres, CTM, Citrovita, and Sucorrico had no sales or exports of subject merchandise for this POR, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3) and consistent with our practice, we are rescinding this review of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil for the period of May 1, 2001, through April 30, 2002. This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: August 8, 2002.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

Deputy Assistant Secretary Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02-20772 Filed 8-14-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A-533-810]**

#### Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Stainless Steel Bar From India

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

**ACTION:** Notice of amended final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 15, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ryan Langan or Cole Kyle, Office 1, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-2613 or (202) 482-1503, 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 ("the Department") regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (April 2000).

## Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of stainless steel bar ("SSB"). SSB means articles of stainless steel in straight lengths that have been either hot-rolled, forged, turned, cold-drawn, cold-rolled or otherwise cold-finished, or ground, having a uniform solid cross section along their whole length in the shape of circles, segments of circles, ovals, rectangles (including squares), triangles, hexagons, octagons, or other convex polygons. SSB includes cold-finished SSBs that are turned or ground in straight lengths, whether produced from hot-rolled bar or from straightened and cut rod or wire, and reinforcing bars that have indentations, ribs, grooves, or other deformations produced during the rolling process.

## Amended Final Results

On July 5, 2002, the Department determined that stainless steel bar from India is not being sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 735(a) of the Act. See *Stainless Steel Bar from India; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review* ("Final Results"), 67 FR 45956 (July 11, 2002). On July 15, 2002, we received ministerial error allegations, timely filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(c)(2), from the petitioners regarding the Department's final margin calculations. Viraj did not submit any ministerial error allegations. However, on July 18, 2002, Viraj submitted comments, timely filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(c)(3), responding to petitioners' ministerial error allegations.

The petitioners contend that the Department inadvertently omitted certain expenses and overstated indirect selling expense deductions when calculating the general and administrative expense ratio in our final results. The petitioners also allege that we incorrectly calculated entered value. The petitioners requested that we correct the errors and publish a notice of amended final results in the **Federal Register**, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(e). Viraj counters that the Department calculated the general and administrative expense ratio correctly and that petitioners' allegation concerning the indirect selling expense deduction is, in fact, a methodological argument and not a ministerial error. Viraj did not comment on the entered value allegation.

In accordance with section 735(e) of the Act, we have determined that certain ministerial errors were made in our final margin calculations. We corrected the general and administrative expense ratio to include certain additional expenses that we inadvertently omitted in the final results. We also corrected the entered value calculation. For a detailed discussion of these ministerial error allegations and the Department's analysis, see Memorandum to Richard W. Moreland, "Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Stainless Steel Bar from India; Allegations of Ministerial Errors" dated August 8, 2002, which is on file in the Central Records Unit ("CRU"), room B-099 of the main Department building.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(e), we are amending the final results of the antidumping duty administrative review of stainless steel bar from India to correct these ministerial errors. However, the