

Comments received in response to this solicitation, including names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposed action and will be available for public inspection. Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered; however, those who submit anonymous comments will not have standing to appeal the subsequent decision under 36 CFR part 215. Additionally, pursuant to 7 CFR 1.27(d), any person may request the agency to withhold a submission from the public record by showing how the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) permits such confidentiality. Requesters should be aware that, under FOIA, confidentiality may be granted in only very limited circumstances, such as to protect trade secrets. The Forest Service will inform the requester of the agency's decision regarding the request for confidentiality, and where the request is denied, the agency will return the submission and notify the requester that the comments may be resubmitted with or without name and address within 7 days.

**Permits or Licenses Required:** Permits required for implementation include the following:

1. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
  - Approvals of discharge of dredged or fill material into the waters of the United States under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act;
  - Approval of the construction of structures or work in navigable waters of the United States under section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899;
2. Environmental Protection Agency
  - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (402) Permit;
  - Review Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan;
3. State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources
  - Tideland Permit and Lease or Easement;
4. State of Alaska, Department of Environmental Conservation
  - Solid Waste Disposal Permit;
  - Certification of Compliance with Alaska Water Quality Standards (401 Certification)

**Responsible Official:** The Forest Supervisor, Tongass National Forest, Federal Building, Ketchikan, Alaska 99901, is the responsible official. The responsible official will consider the comments, response, disclosure of environmental consequences, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making the decision and stating the rationale in the Record of Decision.

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

Dated: May 7, 2006.

**Forrest Cole,**

*Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 06-4495 Filed 5-12-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Natural Resources Conservation Service

#### Yellow River Watershed Structure No. 3: Gwinnett County, GA

**AGENCY:** Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of a finding of no significant impact.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 102[2][c] of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations [40 CFR part 1500]; and the Natural Resources Conservation Service Regulations [7 CFR part 650]; the Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, gives notice that an environmental impact statement is not being prepared for the Yellow River Watershed Structure No. 3, Gwinnett County, Georgia.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Cran Upshaw, Economist, Federal Building, 355 East Hancock Avenue, Athens, Georgia 30601, Telephone [706] 546-2277, e-mail [cran.upshaw@ga.usda.gov](mailto:cran.upshaw@ga.usda.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Environmental Assessment of this federally assisted action indicates that the project will not cause significant local, regional, or national impacts on the environment. As a result of these findings, James E. Tillman, Sr., State Conservationist, has determined that the preparation and review of an environmental impact statement is not needed for this project.

The project purpose is continued flood prevention. The planned works of improvement include upgrading an existing floodwater retarding structure.

The Notice of a Finding of No Significant Impact [FONSI] has been forwarded to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and to various Federal, State, and local agencies and interest parties. A limited number of the FONSI are available to fill single copy requests at the above address. Basic data developed during the environmental assessment are on file and may be reviewed by contacting Cran Upshaw at the above number.

No administrative action on implementation of the proposal will be taken until 30 days after the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**.

Signed in Athens, Georgia, on May 4, 2006.

**James E. Tillman, Sr.,**  
*State Conservationist.*

[This action is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under 10.904, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention, and is subject to the provisions of Executive Order 12372, which requires inter-government consultation with State and local officials].

Finding of No Significant Impact for Yellow River Watershed Structure No. 3 Gwinnett County, Georgia, April 27, 2006.

### Introduction

The Yellow River Watershed is a federally assisted action authorized for planning under Public Law 106-472, the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Act, which amends Public Law 83-566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. An environmental assessment was undertaken in conjunction with development of the watershed plan. This assessment was conducted in consultation with local, State, and Federal agencies as well as with interested organizations and individuals. Data developed during the assessment are available for public review at the following location: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, 355 East Hancock Avenue, Athens, Georgia 30601.

### Recommended Action

This document describes a plan for upgrading an existing floodwater retarding structure, Yellow River Watershed Structure No. 3 [Y-3], to meet current dam safety criteria in Georgia. The plan calls for construction of a roller-compacted concrete labyrinth with orifice spillway over the top of an existing earthen embankment. Works of improvement will be accomplished by providing financial and technical assistance through an eligible local sponsor.

The principal project measures are to:

1. Construct a roller-compacted concrete labyrinth with orifice spillway over the top of an existing earthen embankment. This constructed emergency spillway is designed to bring the existing dam into compliance with current dam safety criteria in Georgia.

2. The measures will be planned and installed by developing a contract with the current operator of the dam.

### Effects of Recommended Action

Installing the roller-compacted concrete labyrinth with orifice spillway will bring Yellow River Watershed Structure No. 3 into compliance with current dam safety criteria. This will essentially eliminate the risk to loss of life for individuals in 39 homes, 1 commercial property, 2 miles of roadway and 5 bridges. Additional effects will include continued protection against flooding, continued water quality benefits, continued

fishing activities, continued recreational opportunities, protected land values, protected road and utility networks, and reduced maintenance costs for public infrastructure.

Wildlife habitat will not be disturbed during installation activities. No wetlands, wildlife habitat, fisheries, prime farmland, or cultural resources will be destroyed or threatened by this project. Some 11.3 acres of wetland and wetland type wildlife habitat will be preserved. Fishery habitats will also be maintained.

No endangered or threatened plant or animal species will be adversely affected by the project.

There are no wilderness areas in the watershed.

#### Alternatives

Seven alternative plans of action were considered in project planning. No significant adverse environmental impacts are anticipated from installation of the selected alternative. Also, the planned action is the most practical, complete, and acceptable means of protecting life and property of downstream residents.

#### Consultation—Public Participation

Original sponsoring organizations include the Gwinnett County Government, Gwinnett County Soil and Water Conservation District, and the Upper Ocmulgee River Resource Conservation and Development Council. At the initiation of the planning process, meetings were held with representatives of the original sponsoring organizations to ascertain their interest and concerns regarding the Yellow River Watershed. Gwinnett County agreed to serve as “lead sponsor” being responsible for leading the planning process with assistance from NRCS. As lead sponsor they also agreed to provide non-federal cost-share, property rights, operation and maintenance, and public participation during, and beyond, the planning process.

An Interdisciplinary Planning Team provided for the “technical” administration of this project. Technical administration includes tasks pursuant to the NRCS nine-step planning process, and planning procedures outlined in the NRCS-National Planning Procedures Handbook. Examples of tasks completed by the Planning Team include, but are not limited to, Preliminary Investigations, Hydrologic Analysis, Reservoir Sedimentation Surveys, Economic Analysis, Formulating and Evaluating Alternatives, and Writing the Watershed Plan—Environmental Assessment. Data collected from partner agencies, databases, landowners, and others throughout the entire planning process, were presented at the public meeting on April 14, 2005. Informal discussions amongst planning team members, partner agencies, and landowners were conducted throughout the entire planning period.

A Technical Advisory Group was developed to aid the Planning Team with the planning process. The following agencies were involved in developing this plan and provided representation on the Technical Advisory Group:

- Gwinnett County Government
- Gwinnett County Soil and Water Conservation Districts
- Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division [EPD], Safe Dams Program
- Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division [WRD], Game and Fisheries Section
- United States Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], Region IV
- USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS]
- USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service [F&WS]
- US Army Corps of Engineers [COE]

#### Public Participation

A public meeting was held on April 14, 2005 to explain the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Program and to scope resource problems, issues, and concerns of local residents associated with the Y-3 project area. Potential alternative solutions to bring Y-3 into compliance with current dam safety criteria were also presented. Through a voting process, eleven meeting participants heard summaries of planning accomplishments to date provided input on issues and concerns to be considered in the planning process, were made aware of results from the reservoir sedimentation survey, and identified which planning alternative [i.e. No Action, Decommission, Structural, Non-Structural] was most desirable.

#### 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 plan of action on Yellow River Watershed Structure No. 3 is not required.

Dated: May 4, 2006.

**James E. Tillman, Sr.,**  
State Conservationist.

[FR Doc. E6-7306 Filed 5-12-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-16-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

(A-201-830)

#### Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico

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

**SUMMARY:** On November 7, 2005, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its second administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico. The review covers two

producers of the subject merchandise. The period of review (POR) is October 1, 2003, through September 30, 2004. Based on our analysis of comments received, these final results differ from the preliminary results. The final results are listed below in the “Final Results of Review” section.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 15, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tipten Troidl or Jolanta Lawska, at (202) 482-1767 or (202) 482-8362, respectively; AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14<sup>th</sup> Street & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On November 7, 2005, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico. See *Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Steel Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Mexico*, 70 FR 67422 (November 7, 2005) (*Preliminary Results*). On December 7, 2005, petitioners<sup>1</sup> requested a hearing, and on December 7, 2005, Hylsa Puebla, S.A. de C.V. (Hylsa) also requested a hearing. On January 6, 2006, both petitioners and Hylsa withdrew their requests for a hearing. No other interested parties requested a hearing.

We invited parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. On December 14, 2005, we received case briefs from Siderurgica Lazaro Cardenas Las Truchas S.A. de C.V. (SICARTSA), Hylsa, and petitioners. All parties submitted rebuttal briefs on December 19, 2005.

#### Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to this order is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter.

Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions for (a) Stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining

<sup>1</sup> Gerdau Ameristeel US Inc., ISG Georgetown Inc., Keystone Consolidated Industries, Inc., and North Star Steel Texas, Inc.