Iowa
Woodbury County Courthouse, 620 Douglas St., Sioux City
Kentucky
Fort Boonesborough Site, Richmond Vicinity
Louisiana
St. Alphonsus, 2054 Constance St. New Orleans
Massachusetts
Hoosac Tunnel, Berkshire County
Mississippi
Dancing Rabbit Creek Treaty Site, Macon Vicinity
New York
69th Regiment Armory, 68 Lexington Ave., New York
Eldridge Street Synagogue, 12–16 Eldridge Street, New York
North Carolina
Bentonville Battlefield, Along State Routes 1008 and 1009, Bentonville Vicinity
Pinehurst Historic District, Vicinity of junction NC 5 and NC 2, Pinehurst, North Carolina
Pennsylvania
St. Peter's Church, Third and Pine Streets, Philadelphia
Church Of The Advocate, 18th and Diamond Streets, Philadelphia
Leap-The-Dips, 700 Park Avenue, Altoona
Rhode Island
The Elms, Bellevue Avenue, Newport
Kingscote, Bellevue Avenue, Newport
Texas
Palmito Ranch Battlefield, South of State Highway 4, Brownsville vicinity
Vermont
Round Church, Bridge Street, Richfield
St. Johnsbury Athenaeum, 30 Main St., St. Johnsbury
Virginia
George C. Marshall House, 217 Edwards Ferry Rd, Leesburg
Wisconsin
Turner Hall, 1034 N. 4th. St., Milwaukee,
Wyoming
Obsidian Cliff, Yellowstone National Park,

And one boundary increase:

Davis and Elkins Historic District, Davis and Elkins College Campus, Elkins, West Virginia

Also, should the necessary waivers be received, the committee will also be considering an additional property:

Spring Hill Ranch, Chase County, Kansas

The committee will also be given an introduction and overview to two upcoming theme studies.

Landscape Architecture in the Parks theme study, Nationwide

Middle Missouri Trench theme study, North and South Dakota

Dated: April 9, 1996.

Carol D. Shull,

Chief, National Historic Landmarks Survey and Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, Washington Office.

[FR Doc. 96–9599 Filed 4–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

Availability of Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of a final supplemental environmental impact statement (EIS) for the proposed mining plan and permit application, Fence Lake Mine, Catron and Cibola Counties, New Mexico and Apache County, Arizona, OSM–EIS–31.

SUMMARY: The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) is making available a final supplemental environmental impact statement (EIS) on the proposed mining plan and permit application for the Fence Lake mine. This is a supplemental EIS to the 1990 Bureau of Land Management EIS, and it updates the identified impacts and analyzes any new probable impacts of mining at the proposed Fence Lake mine. The supplemental EIS has been prepared to assist the Department of the Interior in making a decision on the mining plan and permit application submitted by Salt River Project (SRP) for a surface coal mining operation located approximately 14 miles northwest of Quemado, New Mexico; and for 13 miles of railroad in the State of Arizona.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the final supplemental EIS may be obtained from Richard J. Seibel, Regional Director, Western Regional Coordinating Center, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, 1999 Broadway, Suite 3320, Denver, Colorado 80202–5733, Attn: Dr. Robert H. Block.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Robert H. Block, Project Manager and EIS Team Leader at the Denver, Colorado, location given under **ADDRESSES** (telephone: 303–672–5610).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: SRP's proposed Fence Lake mine consists of Federal, State and private coal leases situated on approximately 18,000 acres northwest of Quemado, New Mexico. The proposed mine would remove approximately 81.3 million tons of coal, by surface methods, over the 50 year life-of-mine. Approximately 1.8 million tons of coal would be removed each year from year 2 through year 28 and about 3 million tons of coal per year would be removed each year from year 29 through year 40. The project also includes a proposed 44-mile railroad corridor that would be constructed west from the mine to supply coal to the existing Coronado Generating Station, located approximately 6 miles from St. Johns, Arizona.

OSM has prepared the supplemental EIS to evaluate the alternative actions that the Department could take on the mining plan in the state of New Mexico and the permitting of the 13 miles of railroad corridor in the State of Arizona. In accordance with the New Mexico State Program, the New Mexico Mining and Minerals Department must take permitting actions on the proposed surface coal mining operation and 31 miles of railroad corridor within the State of New Mexico. Two alternatives are evaluated in the supplemental EIS: (1) approval of the mining plan and permit application with conditions, and (2) disapproval of the mining plan and permit application. OSM has identified ''approval of the proposed mining plan and permit application package with conditions'' as the preferred alternative.

Dated: March 22, 1996.

Richard J. Seibel,

Regional Director, Western Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 96–9528 Filed 4–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–M

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Germany and the Netherlands; Dismissal of Request for Institution of Section 751(b) Review Investigations

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Dismissal of a request to institute section 751(b) investigations concerning the Commission's affirmative determinations in Invs. Nos. 701–TA–340, 731–TA–604, & 731–TA–608 (Final), Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Germany and the Netherlands.

SUMMARY: The Commission determines, pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act)(19 U.S.C. 1675(b)) and Commission rule 207.45 (19 CFR 207.45), that the subject request does not show changed circumstances sufficient to warrant institution of an

investigation to review the Commission's affirmative determinations in Investigations Nos. 701–TA–340, 731–TA–604, & 731–TA–608 (Final), regarding certain cold-rolled carbon steel flat products (cold-rolled steel) from Germany and the Netherlands. Cold-rolled steel is provided for in subheadings 7209.15.00, 7209.16.00, 7209.17.00, 7209.18.15, 7209.18.25, 7209.18.60, 7209.25.00, 7209.26.00, 7209.27.00, 7209.28.00, 7209.90.00, 7210.70.30, 7210.90.90, 7211.23.15, 7211.23.20, 7211.23.30, 7211.23.45, 7211.23.60, 7211.29.20, 7211.29.45, 7211.29.60, 7211.90.00, 7212.40.10, 7212.40.50, 7212.50.00, 7217.10.10, 7217.10.20, 7217.10.30, 7217.10.70, 7217.90.10, and 7218.90.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan Seiger (202–205–3183) or Vera Libeau (202–205–3176), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street S.W., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (http://www.usitc.gov or ftp://ftp.usitc.gov).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: On November 28, 1995, the Commission received a request to review its affirmative threat determinations with respect to Germany and the Netherlands in the light of changed circumstances (the request), pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)). The request was filed by counsel on behalf of Krupp Hoesch Stahl AG, Preussag Stahl AG, Thyssen Stahl AG, and Hoogovens Groep BV, producers of the subject merchandise in Germany and the Netherlands, and N.V.W. (USA), Inc., an importer of the subject merchandise from the Netherlands.

Pursuant to section 207.45(b)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.45(b)(2)), the Commission published a notice in the Federal Register on January 25, 1996 (61 F.R. 2263) requesting comments as to whether the alleged changed circumstances warranted the institution of a review investigation. The Commission received comments both in opposition to and in support of the request.

ANALYSIS: After consideration of the request for review and the responses to the notice inviting comments, the Commission has determined, pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)) and Commission rule 207.45 (19 CFR 207.45), that the information of record, including the petitioner's request, does not show changed circumstances sufficient to warrant institution of an investigation to review the Commission's affirmative determinations in Investigations Nos. 701–TA–340, 731–TA–604, & 731–TA–608 (Final).

As a preliminary matter, the request alleges that the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994 (the URAA) created a lower standard for institution of review investigations under section 751(b); i.e., that the Commission should question actively the continued need for the orders, rather than place the burden of proof on the party seeking revocation. The request claims, for example, that the fact that Congress provided for sunset reviews under 751(c) indicates that Congress intended a lower standard. Contrary to the request, the Commission does not find that the standard for institution of a 751(b) review investigation has changed following the passage of the URAA. First, the URAA did not amend the statutory language governing the institution of a changed circumstances review. Second, the Statement of Administrative Action provides no discussion of the standard for instituting a *review,* stating only that the ''new substantive standard'' for judging the *merits* of a changed circumstances review is ''consistent with current Commission practice.'' SAA at 878. Third, the Commission finds no legal basis for concluding that the URAA provisions on sunset reviews were intended to effect any change in the standard for institution of a 751(b) review.

The Commission also notes that its reviewing courts have observed that ''a review investigation of an outstanding antidumping order does not begin on a clean slate just as though it were an original investigation.'' *See Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co.* v. *United States,* 750 F.2d 927, 932 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Congress set forth ''very strict controls'' on the exercise of the Commission's authority to conduct an investigation to determine whether to revoke or modify an outstanding dumping order, demonstrating that it did not want prior Commission injury determinations ''to remain in a state of flux.'' ''Royal Business Machines, Inc. v. *United States,* 507 F. Supp. 1007, 1014, n. 18 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1980), *aff'd,* 659 F.2d 692 (CCPA 1982). The statutory requirements for instituting Section 751 reviews clearly demonstrate the intent of Congress that the ''underlying finding of injury. . . . . is entitled to deference and should not be disturbed lightly.'' *Avesta AB* v. *United States,* 689 F. Supp. 1173, 1180 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1988)(*Avesta I*); *see also Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd.* v. *United States,* 750 F.2d 927, 932 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In order for a review investigation to be instituted, the information available to the Commission, after notice and comment from all interested parties, must be sufficient to persuade the Commission:

(1) That there have been significant changed circumstances from those in existence at the time of the original investigation;

(2) That those changed circumstances are not the natural and direct result of the imposition of the antidumping or countervailing duty order, and

(3) That the changed circumstances indicate that the domestic industry would be materially injured should the order be revoked, thereby warranting a full investigation.

See A. Hirsh, Inc. v. *United States, 737 F. Supp. 1186 (CIT 1990) (Hirsh II*); *Avesta AB* v. *United States,* 724 F. Supp. 974 (CIT 1989), aff'd 914 F.2d 232 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 111 S. Ct. 1308 (1991) (*Avesta II*).

The request alleged five changed circumstances warranting review: (1) Restructuring of the European steel industry, together with other changes in global market conditions; (2) surges in non-subject imports of cold-rolled steel; (3) the sharp decline of the U.S. dollar against both the Dutch guilder and the German mark; (4) the sharp and unanticipated growth in U.S. production of corrosion-resistant steel subsequent to the imposition of antidumping and countervailing duty orders on corrosion-resistant steel, and; (5) the fact that the orders on Germany and the Netherlands resulted from affirmative threat determinations of three Commissioners who cumulated imports from the Netherlands, Germany, and Korea with far greater volumes from other countries. The information available on the record does not persuade us that a full investigation is warranted for any of the five allegations.

First, the requesting parties argue that changes in the European steel industry, along with other changes in the world market for steel, make it unlikely that the U.S. industry will suffer material injury if the orders are revoked. They point to decreased excess capacity in Europe, to increases in captive consumption of cold-rolled steel by

European steel producers, and to privatization of European steel companies as contributing to a tighter supply situation for cold-rolled steel. Notwithstanding these developments, however, there is evidence of an oversupply of steel and falling steel prices in Europe. Further, the petition does not provide any basis for its claim that privatization has led to tighter steel supplies in general. Nor does the request show a sufficient correlation between increases in captive production of cold-rolled steel in Germany and the Netherlands and decreases in exports to the United States.

Second, the requesting parties contend that imports from Germany and the Netherlands have fallen off and that non-subject imports, particularly from Eastern Europe, have taken their place. The request cites *Birch Three-Ply Door Skins from Japan* as constituting a similar set of facts that formed the basis for a changed circumstances review. Replacement of subject imports by non-subject imports, alone, does not, however, necessarily constitute changed circumstances. The changes in volumes of subject versus non-subject imports at issue here are likely attributable to the effects of the orders. More importantly, there is no evidence that U.S. market share held by the subject imports since the imposition of the order has changed significantly. Finally, there is no evidence indicating that there is a decline in the capacity of the domestic industry rendering it unable to supply the market demand previously supplied by the subject imports. *Compare Birch Three-Ply Door Skins from Japan,* Inv. No. 751–TA–6 (Review), USITC Pub. 1271 (July 1982) (Facilities of domestic producer who accounted for majority of domestic production were sold and devoted to production of other products, while other domestic producers had ceased operations, such that market share held by subject imports shifted to non-subject imports, rather than domestic industry).

Third, the request alleges that since the date of the orders, the U.S. dollar has weakened against the German mark and Dutch guilder, and that accordingly imports from those sources are now less price-competitive and less likely to cause injury. The requesting parties contend that this realignment in exchange rates has led to increased domestic shipments of U.S. steel, and that this trend is likely to increase. Recent history shows, however, that exchange rates between the Netherlands, or Germany, and the United States have fluctuated within a fairly narrow band. Finally, since the request was filed, the U.S. dollar has actually strengthened against the two currencies.

Next, the request claims that as a result of existing AD/CVD orders on corrosion-resistant steel, U.S. demand for cold-rolled steel for use in the production of corrosion-resistant steel has greatly increased, making the industry less vulnerable to imports. This is, however, not a changed circumstance in terms of being a change in the conditions of competition. Moreover, the fact that there is a large captive component to cold-rolled steel production is not a new development. Further, the Commission does not consider the increase in captive consumption of U.S. cold-rolled steel for corrosion-resistant production reported in the request to be of sufficient magnitude to constitute a changed circumstance in the context of this industry. In addition, there is some evidence that the increase in corrosion-resistant steel production has peaked.

The request further asserts that because of the way the Commission voted on the investigations concerning the Netherlands and Germany (with different Commissioners cumulating different combinations of imports), there are now fewer imports at issue than there were at the time of the original investigation, and that such instances have, in the past, warranted institution of 751(b) review investigations. Those cases, however, are distinguishable, as they involved subsequent partial revocations or changed (narrowed) scope determinations by Commerce. See, e.g., Potassium Chloride from Canada, 751–TA–3; Stainless Steel Plate from Sweden, 751–TA–15. In this case, however, all of the facts and circumstances upon which the requesting parties base their claim were known to the Commission at the time of its vote in the original investigations. There is nothing anomalous about imposing an order on imports from countries as to which three or four Commissioners made affirmative determinations. Rather, that is a function of the cumulation and threat provisions of the statute.

In sum, the changed circumstances alleged in the request do not warrant institution of a review. Evidence contained in the request and in responses opposing the request shows either that the alleged changes have not, in fact, had a significant impact on the conditions of competition in this industry or on subject imports, or that the changes have reversed themselves.

In light of the above analysis, the Commission determines that institution of a review investigation under section 751(b) of the Act concerning the Commission's affirmative determinations in Investigations Nos. 701–TA–340, 731–TA–604, & 731–TA–608 (Final), regarding cold-rolled steel from Germany and the Netherlands, is not warranted.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 16, 1996.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–9730 Filed 4–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Tej Pal Singh Jowhal, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On August 28, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Tej Pal Singh Jowhal, M.D., (Respondent), of South Miami, Florida, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, BJ3506170, under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), and deny any pending applications for registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4), because the Florida Board of Medicine suspended his state license to practice medicine, leaving him without state authorization to handle controlled substances. Further, the Order asserted that the Respondent's continued registration was not in the public interest, as that term is used in 21 U.S.C. 823(f), due to his failure to abide by the terms of a Memorandum of Agreement entered into between him and the DEA in February of 1993.

The Order was mailed in the U.S. Mail, and a signed receipt dated September 1, 1995, was returned to DEA. However, neither the Respondent nor anyone purporting to represent him has replied to the Order to Show Cause. More than thirty days have passed since the Order was served upon the Respondent. Therefore, pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.54(d), the Deputy Administrator finds that the Respondent has waived his opportunity for a hearing on the issues raised by the Order to Show Cause, and, after considering the investigative file, enters his final order in this matter without a hearing pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.54(e) and 1301.57.

The Deputy Administrator finds that the Respondent was issued DEA Certificate of Registration BJ3506170, a restricted registration, for his practice in Florida, after entering into a