

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

There are no wilderness areas in the watershed.

Scenic values will be complemented with improved riparian quality and cover conditions resulting from the installation of conservation animal waste management system and grazing land practices.

Alternatives

Six 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 Haynes Creek—Brushy Fork Creek 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. Meetings with the project sponsors were held throughout the planning process, and project sponsors provided representation at planning team, technical advisory, and two public meetings.

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 evaluated at Planning Team meetings. 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).

A meeting and field tour with the Technical Advisory Group was held on May 10, 2004 to assess proposed measures and their potential impact on resources of concern. A review of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) concerns was initiated at this meeting. Effects of proposed measures on NEPA concerns reviewed were documented. Additional field tours were held with the COE to determine the most efficient 404 permitting process.

Suzanne Kenyon, Cultural Resources Specialist with the NRCS-National Water Management Center, visited the project site in the fall of 2001. She provided a methodology for considering culturally significant resources, which was followed in this planning process. An inventory of the watershed, and associated downstream impacted area was completed with no culturally important or archaeological sites noted. The area of potential effect was provided to the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office with passive concurrence provided.

Public Participation: A public meeting was held on March 18, 2004, to explain the Watershed Rehabilitation Program and to scope resource problems, issues, and concerns of local residents associated with the Haynes Creek—Brushy Fork Creek No. 3 project area. Potential alternative solutions to bring No. 3 into compliance with current dam safety criteria were also presented. Through a voting process, meeting participants provided input on issues and concerns to be considered in the planning process, and identified the

most socially acceptable alternative solution.

A second public meeting was held on May 6, 2004, to summarize planning accomplishments, convey results of the reservoir sedimentation survey, and present various structural alternatives. The roller compacted concrete chute spillway was identified as a complete, acceptable, efficient, and effective plan for the watershed and is the alternative preferred by the homeowners as indicated in the public meetings.

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 Haynes Creek—Brushy Fork Creek Watershed Structure No. 3 is not required.

Dated: June 1, 2005.

James E. Tillman, Sr.,

State Conservationist.

[FR Doc. 05–11432 Filed 6–8–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–16–P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Sunshine Act; Meeting

AGENCY: Commission on Civil Rights.

DATE AND TIME: Friday, June 17, 2005, 9:30 a.m.

PLACE: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 624 9th Street, NW., Room 540, Washington, DC 20425.

STATUS:

Agenda

- I. Approval of Agenda
- II. Approval of Minutes of May 13, 2005 Meeting
- III. Announcements
- IV. Staff Director’s Report
- V. State Advisory Committee Issues
 - State Advisory Committee Reports
 - State Advisory Committee Rechartering
- VI. Program Planning
 - Federal Funding of Civil Rights
- VII. Discussion of Future Briefings, Including:
 - Stagnation of the Black Middle Class
- VIII. Web site Management
- IX. Future Agenda Items

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kenneth L. Marcus, Press and Communications (202) 376-7700.

Jenny Park,

Acting Deputy General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 05-11594 Filed 6-7-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335-O-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

A-570-504

Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Petroleum Wax Candles from the People's Republic of China

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request by Shanghai R&R Import Export Company Limited ("Shanghai R&R"), an exporter of subject merchandise, the Department of Commerce (the "Department") initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on petroleum wax candles ("candles") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). No other interested party requested a review of Shanghai R&R. The period of review ("POR") is August 1, 2003, through July 31, 2004. For the reasons discussed below, the Department is rescinding this administrative review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 9, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Walker, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0413.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 3, 2004, the Department published an opportunity to request a review of the antidumping duty order on candles from the PRC. See *Notice of Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review*, 69 FR 46496 (August 3, 2004). Shanghai R&R and Shangyu City Garden Candle Factory ("Garden Candle") made timely requests for an administrative review. On September 22, 2004, the Department initiated the 6th review of candles from the PRC. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part ("Initiation")*, 69 FR 56745 (September 22, 2004).

On February 1, 2005, Garden Candle withdrew from the instant administrative review of candles from the PRC. On March 30, 2004, the Department rescinded the

administrative review of Garden Candle. See *Petroleum Wax Candles from the People's Republic of China: Rescission, in Part, of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 70 FR 16217 (March 30, 2005).

On May 16, 2005, Shanghai R&R submitted its request for withdrawal from the administrative review.

Rescission of Review

If a party that requested a review withdraws its request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review, the Secretary will rescind the review pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations. However, the Secretary may extend this time limit if the Secretary decides that it is reasonable to do so. The Department finds that it is reasonable to extend the time limit by which a party may withdraw its request for review in the instant proceeding. The Department has not yet devoted considerable time and resources to this review, and the Department concludes that the withdrawal does not constitute an abuse of our procedures by the involved party. Therefore, given that the only respondent has withdrawn from, and thereby is no longer participating in the instant review, the Department is rescinding this administrative review of the antidumping duty order on candles from the PRC.

Notification to Importers

This notice 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 assumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3) of the Department's regulations. 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.

This notice is in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR

351.213(d)(4) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: May 31, 2005.

Susan H. Kuhbach,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E5-2983 Filed 6-8-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

North American Free-Trade Agreement, Article 1904; NAFTA Panel Reviews; Completion of Panel Review

AGENCY: NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Completion of Panel Review of the final remand determination made by the U.S. International Trade Commission, in the matter of Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada, Secretariat File No. USA-CDA-2002-1904-09.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Order of the Binational Panel dated April 22, 2005, affirming the final remand determination described above the panel review was completed on April 21, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Caratina L. Alston, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482-5438.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 21, 2005, the Binational Panel issued an order which affirmed the final remand determination of the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) concerning Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada. The Secretariat was instructed to issue a Notice of Completion of Panel Review on the 31st day following the issuance of the Notice of Final Panel Action, if no request for an Extraordinary Challenge was filed. No such request was filed. Therefore, on the basis of the Panel Order and Rule 80 of the *Article 1904 Panel Rules*, the Panel Review was completed and the panelists discharged from their duties effective April 21, 2005.

Dated: June 2, 2005.

Caratina L. Alston,

United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.

[FR Doc. E5-2954 Filed 6-8-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-GT-P