

a regional supplement to Section 37.2 of the Forest Service Special Uses Handbook, FSH 2709.11.

Copies of the interim flat fee schedule and policy are being sent to all holders of Forest Service outfitting and guiding permits in Alaska and other potentially interested parties. In addition, notice of the proposal is being published in local newspapers of record, and the policy and fee schedule are being posted on the worldwide web. The purpose of this notice is to advise others who may have an interest in the interim fee policy.

**DATES:** Effective February 14, 2000. Except for outfitters and guides using the Begich, Boggs Visitor Center, who will continue to operate under the mandatory flat fee schedule that was implemented in 1996, and outfitters and guides who are paying fees that have been determined through a competitive process, permit holders will have the choice of using the interim flat fee schedule or one of the current fee calculations methods for the 1999 and 2000 permit periods through December 31, 2000. Permit holders must notify their permit administrators of their choice of fee calculation methods for the 1999 operating season by March 15, 2000. For the year 2000 operating season, eligible permit holders must select the preferred method of fee calculation prior to the year 2000 operating season. Beginning January 1, 2001, permit fees for all outfitting and guiding in Alaska's national forests will be determined using flat fees except for those permits which have had their fees established by a competitive process.

**ADDRESSES:** For copies of the proposed interim flat fee policy, write to the Regional Forester, Attention: Public Services, Alaska Region, P.O. Box 21628, Juneau, AK 99802-1628 or access the document online at [http://www.fs.fed.us/r10/what's\\_hot/hot.htm](http://www.fs.fed.us/r10/what's_hot/hot.htm).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The local Forest Service Ranger District, Supervisor's Office, or Arn Albrecht, (907) 586-7886, or Don Fisher, (907) 586-7861, in the Alaska Regional Office.

Dated: January 5, 2000.

**Rick D. Cables,**  
Regional Forester.

[FR Doc. 00-679 Filed 1-11-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Rural Utilities Service

#### Freedom Power Station Plant: Notice of Availability of an Environmental Assessment

**AGENCY:** Rural Utilities Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of an environmental assessment.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) is issuing an environmental assessment (EA) for its Federal action related to a project proposed by Southwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc., (SWEC) of Greenville, Illinois. The project consists of constructing a natural gas-fired simple cycle, combustion turbine power generation facility near Wright's Corner in Fayette County, Illinois. RUS may provide financing assistance to SWEC for the project.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Nurul Islam, Environmental Protection Specialist, Rural Utilities Service, Engineering and Environmental Staff, Stop 1571, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-1571, telephone: (202) 720-1414. His e-mail address is [nislam@rus.usda.gov](mailto:nislam@rus.usda.gov). Information is also available from Mr. Joe Richardson, Business Development and Marketing Manager, SWEC, 525 US Route 40, Greenville, IL 62246, telephone (618) 664-1025. Questions and comments should be sent to RUS at the address provided. RUS should receive comments on the EA in writing within 30 days of the publication of this notice to insure that RUS prior to making its environmental impact determination considers them.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** SWEC proposes to construct the Freedom Power Generation Plant near Wright's Corner in Fayette County, Illinois. The primary purpose of the facility is to meet SWEC peak electrical load. The generation unit consists of a turbine similar to those found in commercial airline engines. Natural gas will be used as generating fuel for the plant. The unit will have a peak capacity of 45 MW. The facility will be located on a 1.5-acre tract of land on the east side of County Highway 4 approximately six miles north of the city of St. Elmo, Illinois. The power generated from the facility will be distributed through an existing transmission line owned and operated jointly by SWEC and Ameren. No additional construction of the transmission facility will be required. Kansas-Nebraska Energy will provide natural gas fuel for the facility. The Kansas-Nebraska Energy's gas pipeline

is located about 50 feet from the plant site.

Environmental Audits and Consultants, Inc., of Vandalia, Illinois, prepared an environmental report on behalf of the SWEC and submitted it to RUS for its evaluation. The environmental report describes the project and assesses its potential environmental impacts. RUS has conducted an independent evaluation of the environmental report and believes that it accurately assesses the impacts of the proposed project. This environmental report will serve as RUS' EA of the project. No significant impacts are expected as a result of the construction of the project.

The EA can be reviewed at the headquarters of SWEC and the RUS, at the addresses provided above in this notice.

Questions and comments should be sent to RUS at the address provided in this notice. RUS will accept questions and comments on the EA for at least 30 days from the date of publication of this notice.

Any final action by RUS related to the proposed project will be subject to, and contingent upon, compliance with all relevant Federal environmental laws and regulations and completion of environmental review procedures as prescribed by the 7 CFR Part 1794, Environmental Policies and Procedures.

Dated: January 6, 2000.

**Lawrence R. Wolfe,**  
Acting Director, Engineering and Environmental Staff.

[FR Doc. 00-715 Filed 1-11-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-15-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-485-803]

#### Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Romania: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** On September 7, 1999 the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of review of the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Romania. This review covers one manufacture/exporter of the subject

merchandise to the United States and the period August 1, 1997 through July 31, 1998. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 12, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Fred Baker or Robert James, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III—Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-2924 (Baker), (202) 482-5222 (James).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Applicable Statute**

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 references to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

**Background**

The Department published an antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Romania on August 19, 1993 (58 FR 44167). The Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order for the 1997/98 review period on August 11, 1998 (63 FR 42821). On August 31, 1998, respondents Windmill International PTE Ltd. of Singapore, Windmill International Romania Branch, and Windmill International Ltd. (USA) (collectively "Windmill") requested that the Department conduct an administrative review. On August 31, 1998, we also received a request for an administrative review from Bethlehem Steel Corporation and U.S. Steel Group, a Unit of USX Corporation (petitioners). We published a notice of initiation of the review on September 29, 1998 (63 FR 51893).

Under the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of administrative reviews if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 365 days. See section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. On March 26, 1999, the Department extended the time limit for the preliminary results in this case. See *Cut-*

*to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania; Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 14689.

On September 7, 1999 the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of review of the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Romania (64 FR 48581). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

**Scope of the Review**

The products covered in this review include hot-rolled carbon steel universal mill plates (*i.e.*, flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 millimeters but not exceeding 1,250 millimeters and of a thickness of not less than 4 millimeters, not in coil and without patterns in relief), of rectangular shape, neither clad, plated nor coated with metal, whether or not painted varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances; and certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat-rolled products in straight lengths, of rectangular shape, hot rolled, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, 4.75 millimeters or more in thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the HTS under item numbers 7208.31.0000, 7208.32.0000, 7208.33.1000, 7208.33.5000, 7208.41.0000, 7208.42.0000, 7208.43.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.11.0000, 7211.12.0000, 7211.21.0000, 7211.22.0045, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.50.5000 and 7212.50.0000. Included in this review are flat-rolled products of nonrectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been "worked after rolling")—for example, products which have been bevelled or rounded at the edges. Excluded from this review is grade X-70 plate.

These HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and U.S. Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The period of review is August 1, 1997, through July 31, 1998. This review covers sales of certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate by Windmill International PTE Ltd. of Singapore (Windmill Singapore). Windmill's supplier during the POR was the

unaffiliated producer C.S. Sidex S.A. (Sidex).

**Use of Facts Available**

Section 776(a) of the Act provides that if necessary information is not available on the record, the Department shall use, subject to section 782(d) of the Act, the facts otherwise available in reaching the applicable determination. In this review, information is not on the record to enable the Department to make an adjustment to U.S. price for a miscellaneous fund account using the surrogate value method the Department uses in calculating margins for shipments from non-market economy (NME) countries. Therefore, as a non-adverse facts available, we have made this adjustment using the exact amount Windmill recorded in its books. Windmill records this amount in a market-economy currency. For more information, see comment 3 (below).

**Analysis of Comments Received**

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received comments from the petitioners.

*Comment 1: Use of Surrogate Value for Foreign Inland Freight*

Petitioners argue that the Department erred by using a surrogate value for foreign inland freight, rather than the invoiced value. They argue that even though nothing on the record indicates whether the freight provider was a market economy or non-market economy provider, the record does indicate that the foreign inland freight was invoiced and paid in U.S. dollars, and that therefore the Department should use that value in its computation of net U.S. price.

*Department's Position:* We disagree. Evidence on the record suggests that the foreign inland freight was originally calculated in Romanian lei and only later converted into U.S. dollars prior to invoicing. See Romanian verification exhibit 34 of the August 30, 1999 verification report, p. 3. Furthermore, the address of the freight provider suggests that it was a nonmarket economy provider. *Id.* at 1 and 3. Therefore, in these final results of review, we have continued to use a surrogate value for computation of the foreign inland freight.

*Comment 2: Tax on Foreign Inland Freight*

Petitioners argue that the Department erred by not deducting from the U.S. price the tax that Windmill pays to the Romanian government on the foreign inland freight. They argue that this tax

should be considered a charge incident to bringing the subject merchandise to the United States, and should thus be deducted from the U.S. price. They further argue that even though the tax is invoiced and paid in Romanian lei, the Department should use the U.S. dollar amount of the tax because only that value is on the record.

*Department's Position:* We disagree. Because Windmill paid the tax at issue to the Romanian government, we consider it to be an intra-NME expense. We do not use such expenses in our margin calculations, but rather rely on surrogate values. Therefore, we have continued to rely exclusively on the calculated surrogate value for foreign inland freight.

*Comment 3: Deduction for Miscellaneous Expense Account*

Petitioners argue that the Department erred by failing to deduct from U.S. price a cost Windmill records in its books under the account for "commissions." The verification report describes this accounting code as "a miscellaneous fund used to facilitate, for example, shipments and loading." See the verification report at 28. They argue that this expense should be considered a charge incident to bringing the subject merchandise to the United States, and should thus be deducted from U.S. price. They further argue that even though the expense is paid in Romanian lei, the Department should use the U.S. dollar amount of the expense because only that value is on the record.

*Department's Position:* We agree in part. Contrary to petitioner's assertion, the record does not indicate in what currency this expense was paid, and is unclear as to whether it was paid at all. However, the record does indicate that Windmill recognizes this expense as a cost in its accounting records. Although it is not our practice to make an adjustment for expenses paid, as here, to NME suppliers (except through the use of surrogate values), we regard the expense at issue as a movement expense and, therefore, we agree with petitioners that we should make an adjustment for it. As non-adverse facts available, we have deducted from U.S. price, as petitioners suggested, the exact amount that Windmill records in its accounting records. We used this method because Windmill records the expense in market-economy currency and because the record explains how Windmill determines the amount to be recorded in its books. See the verification report, p. 28.

### Final Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we have determined that a weighted-average dumping margin of 21.07 percent exists for Windmill for the period August 1, 1997 through July 31, 1998.

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department shall issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we have calculated an importer-specific assessment rate by dividing the dumping margin found on the subject merchandise examined by the entered value of such merchandise. We will direct the United States Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries by applying the assessment rate to the entered value of the merchandise entered during the POR.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) the case deposit rate for Windmill will be the rate established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for all other Romanian exporters, the case deposit rate will be the Romania-wide rate made effective by the final determination in the less-than-fair-value investigation (see *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania*, 58 FR 37209 (July 9, 1993)); (3) for non-Romanian exporters of subject merchandise from Romania, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the Romanian supplier of that exporter.

These deposit requirements will remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative

protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under 19 CFR 351.306. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing this administrative review and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 771(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 5, 2000.

**Robert S. LaRossa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 00-744 Filed 1-11-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-825]

### Sebacic Acid From the People's Republic of China; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Amended final results of antidumping duty administrative review of sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China.

**SUMMARY:** On October 19, 1999, the United States Court of International Trade ("CIT") sustained the remand and upheld the Department of Commerce's ("the Department") findings in *Remand Determination: Union Camp Corporation v. United States* ("Second Remand"), Consol. Court No. 97-03-00483, Slip Op. 99-40 (September 2, 1999), affecting the final assessment rate for the 1994/95 administrative review in the case of sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China. See *Union Camp Corporation v. United States*, Slip Op. 99-111, (CIT October 19, 1999) (Consol. Court No. 97-03-00483). Because no appeal was filed within the requested period, that decision is final and conclusive. Therefore, we are amending our final results of review, and we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate entries subject to this review. A summary of the specific issues from the two remands in this case are listed below.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 12, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brandon Farlander or Rick Johnson,