• The DOC's administrative review is also inconsistent with Article 2 of the ADA. Brazil alleges that the DOC's practice of ''zeroing'', when calculating the dumping margin, is disallowed in reviews as well as in investigations.

USTR invites written comments from the public concerning the issues raised in this dispute. Persons who submitted comments in response to the earlier notice in the **Federal Register** published on October 9, 2001, regarding this dispute are requested to resubmit their comments in accordance with the instructions given below.

DATES: Although USTR will accept any comments received during the course of the dispute settlement process, comments should be submitted on or before December 6, 2001, to be assured of timely consideration by USTR.

ADDRESSES: We strongly encourage the public to submit comments by email to *brazilsimetal@ustr.gov,* or by fax to (202) 395–3640. Alternatively, comments may be submitted by U.S. mail, first class, postage prepaid, to Sandy McKinzy, Attn: Brazil Silicon Metal Dispute, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508. Comments delivered by messenger or commercial overnight delivery service will not be accepted.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Katharine J. Mueller, Assistant General Counsel, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC, (202) 395–0317.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 127(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) (19 U.S.C. 3537(b)(1)) requires that notice and opportunity for comment be provided after the United States submits or receives a request for the establishment of a WTO dispute settlement panel. Consistent with this obligation, but in an effort to provide additional opportunity for comment, USTR is providing notice that consultations have been requested pursuant to the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). If such consultations should fail to resolve the matter and a dispute settlement panel is established pursuant to the DSU, such panel, which would hold its meetings in Geneva, Switzerland, would be expected to issue a report on its findings and recommendations within six to nine months after it is established.

Major Issues Raised by Brazil

Section 213 of the URAA (amending Section 733(b)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930) provides, in accordance with Article 5.8 of the ADA, that, for purposes of antidumping investigations, a dumping margin less than or equal to 2 percent is *de minimis.* However, section 351.106(c) of the DOC's regulation, 19 CFR 351.106(c), applies a 0.5 percent *de minimis* standard in the case of ''sunset'' reviews, which are conducted for purposes of determining whether an antidumping duty order should be revoked. In the eighth administrative review of a 1991 antidumping duty order on silicon metal from Brazil, notice of which was published in the **Federal Register** on February 23, 2001, the DOC calculated a dumping margin of 0.63 percent for one of the Brazilian importers. Using the 0.5 percent *de minimis* standard, DOC determined that the requirement for revocation was not met because the dumping margin exceeded the *de minimis* standard. Brazil claims that this determination violates the ADA because, according to Brazil, the ADA requires that the 2 percent standard must be used in both investigations and reviews.

Brazil also argues that the method by which the 0.63 percent dumping margin was calculated is inconsistent with the ADA because it is a result of the DOC's use of ''zeroing''. Chapter 6 of the DOC's Antidumping Manual and Sections 771(35)(A) and (B) of the Tariff Act of 1930 prescribe the use of ''zeroing'', according to which negative dumping margins are counted as ''zero'' in both investigations and reviews. Brazil claims that ''zeroing'' is inconsistent with the principle of fair comparison set out in Article 2 of the ADA. Brazil points out that the panel in *European Communities—Anti-Dumping Duties on Imports of Cotton-Type Bed Linen from India,* WT/DS141/R, concluded that ''zeroing'' is inconsistent with the ADA, and that this finding was affirmed by the Appellate Body, Wt/DS141/AB/R.

Public Comment: Requirements for Submissions

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning the issues raised in the dispute. Comments must be in English and, if sent by U.S. mail, provided in fifteen copies. Commenters are requested not to submit any confidential information at this time. All comments submitted will be made available to the public.

Pursuant to section 127(e) of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3537(e)), USTR will maintain a file on this dispute settlement proceeding, accessible to the public, in the USTR Reading Room, which is located at 1724 F Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508. The public file will include comments received by USTR from the public with respect to the dispute; if a dispute settlement panel is convened, the U.S. submissions to that panel, the submissions, or non-confidential summaries of submissions, to the panel received from other participants in the dispute, as well as the report of the panel; and, if applicable, the report of the Appellate Body. An appointment to review the public file (Docket WTO/DS–239, Brazil Silicon Metal Dispute) may be made by calling Brenda Webb, (202) 395–6186. The USTR Reading Room is open to the public from 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon and 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

A. Jane Bradley,

Assistant United States Trade Representative for Monitoring and Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 01–29140 Filed 11–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

[USCG–2001–10998]

National Coast Guard Museum; Environmental Assessment

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for public comments.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard announces the availability of a draft Environmental Assessment on its proposal to accept a gift of land for purposes of relocating the Coast Guard Museum to a site near the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut. We request your comments on this draft assessment.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Docket Management Facility on or before January 7, 2002.

ADDRESSES: To make sure that your comments and related material are not entered more than once in the docket, please submit them by only one of the following means:

(1) By mail to the Docket Management Facility, (USCG–2001–10998), U.S. Department of Transportation, room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001.

(2) By delivery to room PL–401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

(3) By fax to the Docket Management Facility at 202–493–2251.

(4) Electronically through the web site for the Docket Management System at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

The Docket Management Facility maintains the public docket for this notice. Comments and material received from the public, as well as the draft Environmental Assessment (EA), will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room PL–401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also find this docket, including the draft EA, on the Internet at *http://dms.dot.gov.* (Once you enter the web site, click on ''Search,'' enter the last five digits of the docket number (''10998'') in the search box, and press the Enter key.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this notice, the proposed project, or the associated draft EA, call Frank Esposito, Coast Guard Headquarters, at 202–267–0053. If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Dorothy Beard, Chief, Dockets, Department of Transportation, at 202–366–5149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to submit comments and related material on the draft Environmental Assessment (EA). If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this notice (USCG–2001–10998) and give the reasons for each comment. You may submit your comments and material by mail, hand delivery, fax, or electronic means to the Docket Management Facility at the address under ADDRESSES; but please submit your comments and material by only one means. If you submit them by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit them by mail and would like to know they reached the Facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period.

Proposed Action

The Coast Guard seeks to obtain and operate a new national museum to record and display its rich history and artifacts which document the development of America's oldest continuous sea-going service. A feasibility study has been performed. The study found that many large artifacts, such as historic lifesaving watercraft and helicopters, as well as the vast number of artifacts, cannot be displayed at the current site, Waesche Hall on the grounds of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut, because of a lack of space. The new museum, located in proximity to the Academy, would permit the Coast Guard to bring its large collection of artifacts together for exhibition in a single museum that would serve as an institution of enduring value providing professional growth and development for current and future leaders of the Coast Guard.

The existing 5,000-square-foot museum serves some 20,000 visitors annually. The proposed 40,000-square-foot museum would offer a potential tenfold increase in visitation—up to 200,000 visitors per year.

Draft Environmental Assessment

The Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) is the process federal agencies use to facilitate compliance with relevant environmental requirements relating to their actions. The primary environmental legislation affecting the agency decision-making process is the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This Environmental Assessment (EA) considers the potential environmental impacts of a decision by the Coast Guard, subject to site requirement criteria, whether or not to accept land on which to construct a new National Coast Guard Museum to replace its existing museum.

We are requesting your comments on environmental concerns you may have related to the draft EA. This includes suggesting analyses and methodologies for use in the EA or possible sources of data or information not included in the draft EA. Your comments will be considered in preparing the final EA.

Dated: November 15, 2001.

G.P. Fleming,

Acting Assistant Commandant for Governmental and Public Affairs.

[FR Doc. 01–29081 Filed 11–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The FHWA has forwarded the information collection request described in this notice to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. We published a **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day public comment period on this information collection on August 23, 2001 (66 FR 44432). We are required to publish this notice in the **Federal Register** by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Please submit comments by December 21, 2001.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention: DOT Desk Officer. You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including: (1) Whether the proposed collection is necessary for the FHWA's performance; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways for the FHWA to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the collected information; and (4) ways that the burden could be minimized, including the use of electronic technology, without reducing the quality of the collected information.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: FHWA Highway Design Handbook For Older Drivers and Pedestrians Workshop Participants' Feedback Survey.

Abstract: The FHWA published a revised handbook, ''Guidelines and Recommendations to Accommodate Older Drivers and Pedestrians,'' in 2001 that documents new research findings and technical developments that occurred since the 1998 publication of the ''Older Driver Highway Design Handbook, Recommendation and Guidelines.'' The revised Handbook provides practitioners with a practical information source that links older driver road user characteristics to highway design, operational, and traffic engineering recommendations by addressing specific roadway features. A series of workshops began in 1998 and are continuing. The workshops are designed for highway designers, traffic engineers and highway safety specialists involved in the design and operation of highway facilities and are presented in order to familiarize practitioners with the recommendations and guidelines.

The FHWA will conduct a survey of past and continuing workshop participants. This survey is needed to determine if recommendations and guidelines presented to practitioners in workshops are being utilized in new and redesigned highway facilities to accommodate the needs and functional limitations of an aging population of road users. The survey is also needed to gauge the success of the workshop presentations in imparting information