

NRDC, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental impact statement stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact 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 concerns 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. Reviewers 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.

Comments received, including the names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposal and will be available for public inspection.

(Authority: 40 CFR 1501.7 and 1508.22; Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, Section 21)

Dated: April 6, 2006.

Faye L. Krueger,
Forest Supervisor

[FR Doc. 06-3481 Filed 4-11-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Oregon Coast Provincial Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Oregon Coast Provincial Advisory Committee will meet in Lincoln City, OR, April 20, 2006. The theme of the meeting is Introduction/Overview/Business Planning. The agenda includes: BLM/FS Stewardship

Contracting Briefing, FS ATV National Update, BLM RMP Participation—Role of PAC, BLM 2010, Spotted Owl Recovery/Marbled Murrelet Delisting, Status of the RAC's "2006 topics for Coast PAC", Role of Coast PAC in 2006, Public Comment and Round Robin.

DATES: The meeting will be held April 20, 2006, beginning at 9 a.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Surfides Inn, 2945 NW Jetty Ave., Lincoln City, Oregon 97367.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joni Quarnstrom, Public Affairs Specialist, Siuslaw National Forest, 541-750-7075, or write to Siuslaw National Forest Supervisor, P.O. Box 1148, Corvallis, OR 97339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting is open to the public. Council Discussion is limited to Forest Service/BLM staff and Council Members. Lunch will be on your own. A public input session will be at 11:30 a.m. for fifteen minutes. The meeting is expected to adjourn around 3 p.m.

Dated: April 6, 2006.

H. "Wood" Fine,
Director of Operations.

[FR Doc. 06-3482 Filed 4-11-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

[06-GL-S]

Designation for the State of Texas Area

AGENCY: Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) announces the designation of Intercontinental Grain Inspections, Inc. (Intercontinental), to provide official inspection services under the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended (Act).

DATES: Effective Date: April 10, 2006.

ADDRESSES: USDA, GIPSA, John R. Sharpe, Division Director, Compliance Division, STOP 3604, Room 1647-S, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-3604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John R. Sharpe at 202-720-8262, e-mail John.R.Sharpe@usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This action has been reviewed and determined not to be a rule or regulation as defined in Executive Order 12866 and Departmental Regulation 1512-1;

therefore, the Executive Order and Departmental Regulation do not apply to this action.

In the February 1, 2006, **Federal Register** (71 FR 5232), GIPSA announced that Global Grain Inspection Services, Inc. (Global), asked GIPSA to voluntarily cancel their designation to provide domestic grain inspection services in the area for which they were designated in the State of Texas effective April 9, 2006. Accordingly, Global's designation will cease effective April 9, 2006, and GIPSA asked persons or organizations interested in providing official grain inspection services in the State of Texas to submit an application for designation by March 3, 2006.

There were three applicants for the Texas geographic area: A company proposing to do business as Gulf Country Inspection Service, Inc (Gulf); a company proposing to do business as Intercontinental Grain Inspections, Inc. (Intercontinental), a subsidiary of Socit Gnrale de Surveillance North America, Inc. (SGS); and South Texas Grain Inspection LLC (South Texas), a proposed organization being formed by the Corpus Christi Grain Exchange, Inc. (CCGE), to function under a trust. Gulf and Intercontinental indicated they would be willing to accept more or less geographic area previously designated to Global in order to provide needed service to all requestors. South Texas applied only for the Texas Counties named in the February 1, 2006, **Federal Register**. GIPSA asked for comments on Gulf, Intercontinental, and South Texas, in the March 14, 2006, **Federal Register**.

Comments were due by March 29, 2006. GIPSA received a total of 17 comments by the closing date. GIPSA received 1 comment from a grain association supporting Gulf for designation. We received 7 comments supporting Intercontinental for designation; 4 of which were from grain elevators in the area, 2 from prospective employees, and 1 from a border bridge owner. GIPSA received 8 comments supporting South Texas for designation; 7 of which were from grain industry in the area and one from a congressional office. The final commenter, a grain company official, supported both Intercontinental and South Texas.

GIPSA evaluated all available information regarding the designation criteria in Section 7(f)(1)(A) of the Act and, according to Section 7(f)(1)(B), determined that Intercontinental is better able to provide official services in the geographic area specified in the February 1, 2006, **Federal Register**, for which it applied. Intercontinental is designated for 18 months only, effective April 10, 2006, and terminating

September 30, 2007. Intercontinental will be headquartered in Fort Worth, Texas.

Given Global's cancellation date of April 9, 2006, there was not sufficient time to solicit and designate a replacement agency and have a new agency begin. For these reasons, interested persons that want to obtain official services in the Texas area North of Interstate 10 should call the FGIS Wichita Field Office at 316-722-6370 and South of Interstate 10 should call the FGIS League City Field Office at 281-338-2787 to obtain interim service until Intercontinental begins service.

Authority: Pub. L. 94-582, 90 Stat. 2867, as amended (7 U.S.C. 71 *et seq.*).

David R. Shipman,

Acting Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-5400 Filed 4-11-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-EN-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-824]

Certain Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip from India: Preliminary Results and Rescission in Part of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to requests by certain producers/exporters of the subject merchandise and petitioners,¹ the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet and strip (PET film) from India. This review covers three producers/exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.

The Department has preliminarily determined that certain companies subject to this review made U.S. sales at prices less than normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results of review. We will issue the final results of

review no later than 120 days from the date of publication of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 12, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Magd Zalok (MTZ), Drew Jackson (Polyplex), or Kavita Mohan (Jindal), AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-4162, (202) 482-4406, or (202) 482-3542, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 1, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on PET film from India. *See Notice of Amended Final Antidumping Duty Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from India*, 67 FR 44175 (July 1, 2002) (Amended Final Determination). On July 1, 2005, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order on PET film from India. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 70 FR 38099 (July 1, 2005).

In accordance with 19 CFR § 351.213(b)(2), the following producers/exporters requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of their sales and entries of subject merchandise into the United States during the POR: Garware Polyester Limited (Garware), MTZ Polyfilms, Ltd. (MTZ), and Jindal Poly Films Limited² (Jindal). Additionally, in accordance with 19 CFR § 351.213(b)(1), on July 29, 2005, petitioners requested that the Department conduct a review of Polyplex Corporation Ltd. (Polyplex) and Jindal. On August 29, 2005, the Department initiated an administrative review of Garware, Jindal, MTZ, and Polyplex. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 70 FR 51009 (August 29, 2005).

On August 9, 2005, the Department issued its antidumping questionnaire to Garware, Jindal, Polyplex, and MTZ. Subsequently, Garware and Jindal withdrew their respective requests for administrative reviews. In September and October 2005, Jindal, Polyplex, and MTZ responded to the Department's antidumping questionnaire. Thereafter,

the Department issued supplemental questionnaires to Jindal, Polyplex, and MTZ and received timely responses. The petitioners submitted no comments regarding the respondents' questionnaire and supplemental questionnaire responses.

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Period of Review

The POR is July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.

Scope of the Order

For purposes of this order, the products covered are all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed PET film, whether extruded or coextruded. Excluded are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches thick. Imports of PET film are currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item number 3920.62.00.90.³ HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Partial Rescission of Review

19 CFR § 351.213(d)(1) provides that the Department will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if a party that requested a review withdraws its request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested administrative review. On September 14, 2005, before the 90-day time period expired, Garware withdrew its request to be reviewed by the Department and no other parties requested an administrative review of Garware. Consequently, the Department is rescinding this administrative review with respect to Garware.

Although Jindal withdrew its request to be reviewed, petitioners requested a review of Jindal. Therefore, we have not rescinded this review with respect to Jindal.

Comparison Methodology

In order to determine whether the respondents sold PET film to the United States at prices less than NV, the Department compared the export price (EP) and constructed export price (CEP)

¹ The petitioners are Dupont Teijin Films, Mitsubishi Polyester Film Of America, Toray Plastics (America), Inc., and SKC America, Inc.

² Formerly Jindal Polyester Limited.