created based on unique land features, biophysical characteristics, and/or the lands relationship to adjacent communities. All proposed amendment language is in addition to all the current Forest Plan direction.

The past and proposed scoping process for this project is as follows. In May of 1999 the *Ideas for change* was published that described the need for considering changes and a variety of ideas and as a formal scoping document. The public responded by attending open houses, writing letters, and e-mails or attending topic-oriented meetings. Further analysis refined the scope of the FLEA analysis and the Proposed Action was published in September of 2001. The Proposed Action contains the actual replacement page language proposed for the Forest Plan. The replacement language consists of clarification, new language on topics where the Forest Plan was previously silent and management direction changes. One open house was held in September 2001 for the Proposed Action. For the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) there is one public presentation planned in late May or June, for a joint meeting of the Coconino County Board of Supervisors and the Flagstaff City Council. Date and location will be arranged later. No additional public meetings are scheduled at this time, however, the public is welcome to request presentations of information, obtain a copy of the DEIS and write or e-mail in their comments.

Issues include disagreement with the Proposed Action related to Recreation Opportunity Settings at certain sites, and requirements for big game hiding/thermal cover in areas of fire risk concern.

Four alternatives have been developed that include a different mix of forest settings and wildlife cover requirements.

No permits or licenses are required.

This Forest Plan amendment will be referenced during project-level analysis and decision-making. Implementation of the desired condition described in the Forest Plan, including this amendment, will occur over a period of years.

The estimated date for availability of the DEIS is May 2002. The estimated date for filing the Final Environmental Impact Statement is September 2002.

Comments may be sent by electronic mail (e-mail) to *dkill@fs.fed.us* Please reference the FLEA EIS on the subject line. Please include your name and physical mailing address with your comments so documents pertaining to this project may be mailed to you.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. To be the most helpful, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible and may address the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed (see Council of Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3).

In addition, Federal court decisions have established that reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewers' position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* v. *NRDC* 435 US 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. *City of Angoon* v. *Hodel* 9th Circuit, 1986 and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc.* v. *Harris*, 490F. Supp.1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). The reason for this is to ensure that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider 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 DEIS 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.

Dated: April 11, 2002.

Rodger Zanotto,

Acting Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 02–9268 Filed 4–16–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Woronkofski Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Revision of the notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The previous notice published in the Federal Register (Vol. 65, No. 183, pgs. 56864–56865, Sept. 20, 2000) is revised to update the estimated filing dates of the draft and final environmental impact statements, and include changes in the proposed action and purposes and need. The Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposal to harvest timber in the Woronkofski Timber Sale project area, Wrangell Ranger District, Tongass National Forest. The proposed action is to harvest an estimated 10 million board feet (mmbf) on approximately 1000 acres, with 2 miles of road construction and 2 miles of reconstruction, and development of two new log transfer facilities. The range of alternatives being developed to respond to the significant issues, besides no action, will likely be 5–15 million board feet of timber on an estimated 700–1500 acres in one or more timber sales. The purpose and need of the timber sale is to: contribute to the production of a sustained yield of timber and mix of other resource activities from the Tongass National Forest, consistent with Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines; seek to provide a timber supply sufficient to meet the annual and planning cycle market demand for Tongass National Forest timber; provide a diversity of opportunities for resource uses that contribute to the economies of Southeast Alaska; and support a wide range of natural resource employment opportunities within Southeast Alaska's communities. The Tongass Forest Supervisor will decide on whether or not to harvest timber from this area, and if so, how this timber would be harvested. The decision will be documented in a Record of Decision based on the information disclosed in the EIS and the goals, objectives and desired future conditions as stated in the Forest Plan.

DATES: Opportunities for comment are available throughout the process. Individuals interested in receiving a scoping package should contact us within 30 days of the publication of this NOI. Comments will be most helpful if received by 3/31/02. Additional opportunities for comment will be provided after the release of the Draft EIS, projected to be in the summer of 2002.

ADDRESSES: Please send written comments to Wrangell Ranger District;

Attn: Woronkofski EIS; PO Box 51, Wrangell, AK 99929.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chip Weber, District Ranger; Randy Hojem, District Planning Staff; or Dee Galla, IDT Leader; Wrangell Ranger District, Tongass National Forest, PO Box 51, Wrangell, AK 99929 telephone (907) 874–2323.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This revised notice is required by the Forest Service handbook (FSH 1909.15, 21.2). The proposed timber harvest is located within Tongass Forest Plan Value Comparison Unit 461 on Woronkofski Island, Alaska, Wrangell Ranger District of the Tongass National Forest. Approximately 95% of proposed sale units are located within the Woronkofski Inventoried Roadless Area. The Forest Service is reevaluating its Roadless Area Conservation Rule (Roadless Rule) and is currently enjoined from implementing all aspects of the Roadless Rule by the US District Court, District of Idaho. In 2001, the Secretary of Agriculture began a review of the roadless area rule and the Chief of the Forest Service undertook a review of the road management policy. These reviews have led the agency to initiate several Interim Directives with the intent that the values associated with inventoried roadless areas are fully considered within the context of forest planning. In Sierra Club v. Lyons (J00–0009 (CV)), the US District Court, District of Alaska enjoined the Tongass National Forest from taking any action to change the wilderness character of any eligible roadless area until a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) has been completed. The injunction was lifted and the Forest Service is currently preparing the SEIS to address wilderness recommendations. Planning for the Woronkofski Timber Sale Project will continue simultaneously and in coordination with the SEIS and meet the requirements in the Interim Directives. The sale is currently listed on the Tongass 10-year action plan to be sold in 2005. The repercussions of delaying the project planning process regarding road building and timber harvest, even for a relatively short period, can have a significant effect on the amount of timber available for sale on the Tongass over the next few years. The Woronkofski Timber Sale Project is consistent with the 1997 Tongass Land Management Plan.

Public participation has been and will continue to be an integral component of the study process and will be especially important at several points during the analysis. The first occurred during the initial scoping process conducted in the Spring of 1999. That was followed up with a second scoping package sent out with the original Notice of Intent for this project, published in the **Federal Register** (Vol. 65, No. 183, pgs. 56864–56865, Sept. 20, 2000). The Forest Service sought and received information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, local agencies, Tribal Governments, individuals and organizations that expressed an interest in, or felt they may be affected by, the proposed activities. The Fall 2000 scoping package included: (1) Identification of potential issues; (2) identification of issues to be analyzed in depth; and (3) identification of preliminary alternatives. Tentative issues identified for analysis in the EIS include the potential effects of the project on the relationship of the project to: scenic quality, wildlife habitat, project economics, and effects on the roadless area. People interested in obtaining the scoping package sent out in the Fall of 2000 may contact Dee Galla, IDT Leader for this project at the address listed above.

Based on results of scoping and the resource capabilities within the project area, alternatives including a ''no action'' alternative will be developed for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS). The Draft EIS is projected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in summer 2002. The Final EIS is anticipated in the spring of 2003.

The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

The Forest Service believes it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* v. *NRDC,* 435 U.S. 519, 553, (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft environmental impact statement stage may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon* v. *Hodel,* 803 F.2nd 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 of the proposed action, comments during scoping and 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 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 parts 215 or 217. 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: Permits required for implementation include the following:

1. U.S. Army Corp of Engineers

—Approval 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 of work in navigable waters of the United Sates 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)

Thomas Puchlerz, 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.

Dated: February 12, 2002.

Thomas Puchlerz,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 02–9301 Filed 4–16–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Intergovernmental Advisory Committee Meeting

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Intergovernmental Advisory Committee (IAC) will meet on May 2, 2002, at the Double Tree Hotel, Lloyd Center, 1000 NE Multnomah, Portland, Oregon 97220. The primary purpose of the meeting is to continue with discussions on implementation of the Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP). The meeting is scheduled to begin at 10 a.m. and continue until 4:30 p.m. Agenda items to be discussed include, but are not limited to: Options for the Supporting Organizational Structure for the NWFP, Endangered Species Act salmonid Recovery Planning, Potential Future Direction of NWFP implementation, and recent court rulings related to the NWFP. The IAC meeting will be open to the public and is fully accessible for people with disabilities. Interpreters are available upon request at least 10 days in advance of the meeting. Written comments may be submitted for the record at the meeting. A time slot for oral public comments during the meeting is scheduled. Interested persons are encouraged to attend.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions regarding this meeting may be directed to Steve Odell, Executive Director, Regional Ecosystem Office, 333 S.W. First Avenue, P.O. Box 3623, Portland, OR 97208 (Phone: 503–808–2165).

Dated: April 11, 2002.

Stephen J. Odell,

Designated Federal Official.

[FR Doc. 02–9267 Filed 4–16–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–351–605]

Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice from Brazil; Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request by the petitioners and one producer/exporter of the subject merchandise, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review is May 1, 2000, through April 30, 2001.

We have preliminarily determined that no sales have been made below the normal value by Branco Peres Citrus S.A. in this review. In addition, we have preliminarily determined to rescind the review with respect to Citrovita Agro-Industrial Ltda., CTM Citrus S.A., and Sucorrico S.A. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this administrative review, we will instruct the Customs Service not to assess antidumping duties on any entries subject to this review.

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who wish to submit comments in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument: (1) a statement of the issue; and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 17, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Irina Itkin or Elizabeth Eastwood, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 2, 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:

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 are to the Department's regulations at 19 CFR part 351 (2001).

Background

On May 1, 2001, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice (FCOJ) from Brazil (66 FR 21740).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), on May 31, 2001, one producer and exporter of FCOJ, Branco Peres Citrus, S.A. (Branco Peres), requested an administrative review covering the period May 1, 2000, through April 30, 2001. On May 31, 2001, the petitioners, Florida Citrus Mutual, Caulkins Indiantown Citrus Co., Citrus Belle, Citrus World, Inc., Orange-Co of Florida, Inc., Peace River Citrus Products, Inc., and Southern Gardens Citrus Processors Corp., also requested an administrative review for the following four producers and exporters of FCOJ: Branco Peres; Citrovita Agro-Industrial Ltda. and its affiliated parties Cambuhy MC Industrial Ltda. and Cambuhy Citrus Comercial e Exportadora (collectively ''Citrovita''); CTM Citrus S.A. (CTM); and Sucorrico S.A. (Sucorrico). On June 4, 2001, we issued questionnaires to each of these companies.

On June 19, 2001, the Department initiated an administrative review for Branco Peres, Citrovita and its affiliates Cambuhy and Cambuhy Exportadora, CTM, and Sucorrico (66 FR 32934).

On August 1, 2001, Sucorrico informed the Department that it had no shipments of subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review (POR). We reviewed Customs data to confirm that neither Sucorrico nor CTM had shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. Consequently, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3) and consistent with our practice, we are preliminarily rescinding our review for CTM and Sucorrico. For further discussion, see the ''Partial Rescission of Review'' section of this notice, below.

In August 2001, we received a response from Branco Peres to sections