

will turn to the northwest on an existing Georgia Power Company 115 kV transmission line right-of-way for approximately 5 miles. The existing 115 kV transmission line will be reconstructed as an underbuild of the 230 kV transmission line. (The 230 kV and 115 kV transmission lines would share the same transmission line support structures.) The existing right-of-way will not need to be widened. The transmission line would then turn to the southwest on a new right-of-way along Peachtree Industrial Boulevard for approximately 1.6 miles to the Shoal Creek Substation to be located in Gwinnett County southwest of the intersection of Tuggle Greer Road and Peachtree Industrial Boulevard. (Georgia Power Company will construct the Shoal Creek Substation.) The new right-of-way will be forty (40) feet in width. This portion of the transmission line will also be underbuilt with a 115 kV transmission line. Both the 230 kV and the 115 kV transmission lines will connect to the Shoal Creek Substation. The portion of the 230 kV transmission line to parallel the 500 kV transmission line will be supported by single pole concrete structures. The 230 kV portion of the transmission line to be underbuilt with the 115 kV transmission line will be supported by single pole steel or concrete structures. It is anticipated that the transmission lines will be completed and energized by May 2003.

Copies of the FONSI are available for review at, or can be obtained from, RUS at the address provided herein or from Ms. Wende Martin, Georgia Transmission Corporation, 2100 East Exchange Place, Tucker, Georgia 30085-2088, telephone (770) 270-7591. Ms. Martin's e-mail address is wende.martin@gatrans.com.

Dated: March 5, 2002.

Blaine D. Stockton,
*Assistant Administrator, Electric Program,
Rural Utilities Service.*

[FR Doc. 02-5734 Filed 3-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Utilities Service

Distance Learning and Telemedicine Loan and Grant Program

AGENCY: Rural Utilities Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of application filing deadline.

SUMMARY: The Rural Utilities Service (RUS) announces its Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program application window for funding during fiscal year

(FY) 2002. For FY 2002, \$27 million in grants and \$300 million in loans will be made available for distance learning and telemedicine projects serving rural America. The funding will be provided in three categories: (1) \$17 million will be available for grants; (2) \$200 million will be available for loans; and (3) \$110 million will be available for combination grants and loans (\$100 million in loans paired with \$10 million in grants, *i.e.*, \$10 loan: \$1 grant ratio).

DATES: Applications for grants must be postmarked no later than May 13, 2002. Applications for FY 2002 loans or combination loans and grants may be submitted at anytime up to August 31, 2002, and will be processed on a first-come, first serve basis.

ADDRESSES: Applications are to be submitted to the Rural Utilities Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., STOP 1550, Washington, DC 20250-1550. Applications should be marked "Attention: Director, Advanced Services Division, Telecommunications Program."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Marilyn J. Morgan, Branch Chief, Distance Learning and Telemedicine Branch, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Utilities Service, STOP 1550, Room 2838, South Building, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-1550. Telephone: (202) 720-0413, FAX: (202) 720-1051.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For FY 2002, \$17 million in grants, a combination of \$10 million in grants paired with \$100 million in loans, and \$200 million in loans will be made available for distance learning and telemedicine projects. RUS encourages early submission of grant applications to determine whether all required items specified in 7 CFR 1703.125 are clearly in form, identifiable, and complete. RUS will examine, provide comment, and return applications that include items that would disqualify them from further consideration for modification if they are submitted by Friday, April 12, 2002. All applications for grants must be postmarked no later than Monday, May 13, 2002, to be eligible for FY 2002 grant funding. Each application will be reviewed for completeness in accordance with 7 CFR part 1703, subparts D, E, F, and G. Ineligible applications will be returned within 15 working days of receipt.

Notice is hereby given that under 7 CFR 1703.124, 1703.133, and 1703.143, RUS has determined the maximum amount of an application for a grant that will be considered for funding in FY

2002 as \$500,000. The maximum amount for a loan, generally, that will be considered for funding in FY 2002 is \$10 million. However, RUS may fund a project greater than \$10 million subject to the project's feasibility and the availability of loan funds.

Applications for financial assistance must be submitted in accordance with 7 CFR part 1703, subparts D, E, F, and G, which establish the policies and procedures for submitting an application for financial assistance. These subparts and an application guide to assist in the preparation of applications are available on the Internet at the following address: <http://www.usda.gov/rus/telecom/dlt/dltpublications.htm>. Application guides may also be requested from RUS by contacting the Distance Learning and Telemedicine Branch, USDA-RUS, Phone: (202) 720-0413.

Dated: March 4, 2002.

Hilda Gay Legg,

Administrator, Rural Utilities Service.

[FR Doc. 02-5732 Filed 3-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Export Administration

Action Affecting Export Privileges; Infocom Corporation, Inc., Tetrabal Corporation, Ihsan Medhat "Sammy" Elashi, Also Known as I. Ash and Haydee Herrera and Doing Business as Kayali Corp.; Abdulah Al Nasser, Maysson Al Kayali, Mynet. Net Corp. Bayan Medhat Elashi, Ghassan Elashi, Basman Medhat Elashi, Hazim Elashi, Fadwa Elafrangi; Renewal of Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges

In the Matter of: Infocom Corporation, Inc., 630 International Parkway, Suite 100, Richardson, Texas 75081; Tetrabal Corporation, Inc., 605 Trail Lake Drive, Richardson, Texas 75081, and 908 Audelia Road, Suite 200, PMB #245, Richardson, Texas 75081, and Ihsan Medhat "Sammy" Elashi also known as: I. Ash and Haydee Herrera, and doing business as Kayali Corp., 605 Trail Lake Drive, Richardson, Texas 75081 and 908 Audelia Road, Suite 200, PMB #245, Richardson, Texas 75081; Respondents Abdulah Al Nasser, 605 Trail Lake Drive, Richardson, Texas 75081 and 908 Audelia Road, Suite 200, PMB #245, Richardson, Texas 75081; Maysoon Al Kayali, 605 Trail Lake Drive, Richardson, Texas 75081 and 908 Audelia Road, Suite 200, PMB #245, Richardson, Texas 75081; Mynet.Net Corp, Richardson, Texas 75081 and 908 Audelia Road, Suite 200, PMB #245, Richardson, Texas 75081; Bayan Medhat Elashi, 1810 Auburn, Richardson, Texas 75081; Ghassan Elashi, 304 Town House Lane, Richardson, Texas 75081; Basman Medhat Elashi, 1506

Willow Crest Drive, Richardson, Texas 75081; Hazim Elashi, 937 Stone Trail Drive, Plano, Texas 75023; Fadwa Elafrangi, 306 Town House Lane, Richardson, Texas 75081; Related persons.

Through the Office of Export Enforcement (“OEE”), the Bureau of Export Administration (“BXA”), United States Department of Commerce, has asked me to renew and modify the order pursuant to Section 766.24 of the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR parts 730–774 (2001)) (“EAR” or “Regulations”),¹ temporarily denying all United States export privileges to Infocom Corporation, Inc., 630 International Parkway, Suite 100, Richardson, Texas 75081 (“Infocom”) that was issued on September 6, 2001.² BXA has asked that I modify the order by naming Tetrabal Corporation, Inc. (“Tetrabal”) and Ihsan Medhat “Sammy” Elashi (“Ihsan Elashi”) as respondents rather than related persons, and that I list modified addresses and aliases as set out in the caption of this order. Further, BXA has asked that I add the following related persons: Abdulah Al Nasser; Maysoun Al Kayali; and Mynet.Net Corp, all with addresses at: 605 Trail Lake Drive, Richardson, Texas 75081 and 908 Audelia Road, Suite 200, PMB #245, Richardson, Texas 75081.

In its request, BXA states that, based upon the evidence previously adduced and the continuing investigation by OEE, BXA believes that Infocom, Tetrabal, and Ihsan Elashi have violated the Regulations by shipping and attempting to ship goods to Libya and Syria without obtaining the necessary authorizations from BXA and further violated the Regulations by shipping

goods in violation of the original denial order. Since the September 6 order, Ihsan Elashi has made at least 10 exports of computer equipment that violated the order. Abdulah Al Nasser and Maysoun Al Kayali assisted Ihsan Elashi in making some of these exports in violation of the denial order. Additionally, Ihsan Elashi used Mynet.net as the exporter for at least one of the shipments. In several of these exports, Ihsan Elashi used concealment and subterfuge to attempt to conceal his exports which violated the terms of the September 6 order.

The Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement previously found the TDO was consistent with the public interest to preclude future violations of the Regulations. I find that the need for the TDO continues. The evidence that Infocom committed repeated violations of the Regulations that were deliberate and covert, that it actively sought to engage in further export transactions, that, given the nature of the items shipped, future violations could go undetected makes it necessary to give notice to companies in the United States and abroad that they should cease dealing with the respondents in export transactions involving U.S.-origin items, and that Infocom has continued doing business with Ihsan Elashi and Tetrabal. The need for the continuation of the TDO and the naming of Ihsan Elashi and Tetrabal as denied persons is also established by the flagrant violations of the order that have occurred more recently. A TDO that also names Ihsan Elashi and Tetrabal is clearly consistent with the public interest to preclude future violations of the Regulations.

Accordingly, I am renewing this order with the amendments requested by BXA because I have concluded that a TDO is necessary, in the public interest, to prevent an imminent violation of the Regulations.

It is therefore ordered: First, that Infocom Corporation, Inc., 630 International Parkway, Suite 100, Richardson, Texas 75081, Tetrabal Corporation, Inc., 605 Trail Lake Drive, Richardson, Texas 75081 and 908 Audelia Road, Suite 200, PMB #245, Richardson, Texas 75081, and Ihsan Medhat “Sammy” Elashi, also known as I. Ash and Haydee Herrera, same addresses as Tetrabal, (collectively, “the denied persons”) and the following persons subject to the order by their relationship to the denied person Bayan Medhat Elashi, 810 Auburn, Richardson, Texas 75081; Ghassan Elashi, 304 Town House Lane, Richardson, Texas 75081; Basman Medhat Elashi, 1506 Willow Crest Drive, Richardson, Texas 75081; Hazim

Elashi, 937 Stone Trail Drive, Plano, Texas 75023; Fadwa Elafrangi; 306 Town House Lane; Richardson, Texas 75081, and Abdulah Al Nasser, Maysoun Al Kayali, and Mynet.net Corp, all three at the same addresses as Tetrabal, (“the related persons”) (together, the denied person and the related persons are “persons subject to this order”) may not, directly or indirectly, participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as “item”) exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR), or in any other activity subject to the EAR, including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR; or

C. Benefiting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR.

Second, that no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of a person subject to this order any item subject to the EAR;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by a person subject to this order of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby a person subject to this order acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from a person subject to this order of any item subject to the EAR that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from a person subject to this order in the United States any item subject to the EAR with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned,

¹ The Regulations were issued pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1979 (“Act”), 50 U.S.C. app. sections 2401–2420 (1994 & Supp. IV 1998), as reauthorized by Act of November 13, 2000, Pub. L. 106–508, 114 Stat. 2360. The Act lapsed on August 20, 2001. Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701–1706 (1994 & Supp. IV 1998)), the President, through Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 (66 FR 44025 (August 22, 2001)), has continued the Regulations in force.

² On February 27, 2002, Counsel for Infocom filed Opposition of Infocom Corporation, Inc., Bayan Medhat Elashi, Ghassan Elashi and Basman Medhat Elashi (“The Three Brothers”) to Renewal of Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges. On March 1, 2002, counsel for OEE filed “Response to Opposition of Infocom Corporation, Inc., et al. to Renewal Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges (TDO)” (“OEE Response”). The OEE Response argues that The Three Brothers lack standing because they are “Related Persons” in the September 6th Order and, as such, may not oppose Renewal of the Order. OEE cites § 766.2(3)(c) of the EAR as authority for its position. I find the arguments raised by OEE on this issue, both in its pleadings and at oral argument, to be persuasive. Only Infocom has standing to oppose Renewal of the TDO.

possessed or controlled by a person subject to this order, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by a person subject to this order if such service involves the use of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Third, that, in addition to the related persons named above, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in section 766.23 of the EAR, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to the denied person by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this order.

Fourth, that this order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the EAR where the only items involved that are subject to the EAR are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(e) of the Regulations, Infocom, Tetrabal, or Ihsan Elashi may, at any time, appeal this Order by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022. A related person may appeal to the Administrative Law Judge at the aforesaid address in accordance with the provisions of Section 766.23(c) of the Regulations.

This Order is effective on March 4, 2002 and shall remain in effect for 180 days.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(d) of the Regulations, BXA may seek renewal of this Order by filing a written request not later than 20 days before the expiration date. Infocom, Tetrabal, or Ihsan Elashi may oppose a request to renew this Order by filing a written submission with the Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement, which must be received not later than seven days before the expiration date of the Order.

A copy of this Order shall be served on Infocom, Tetrabal, and Ihsan Elashi and each related person and shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

Entered this 4th day of March, 2002.

Lisa A. Prager,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 02-5676 Filed 3-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-852]

Creatine Monohydrate From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty review.

SUMMARY: On November 6, 2001, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on creatine monohydrate from the People's Republic of China. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment. Based upon our analysis of the comments and information received, we have made changes to the margin calculations presented in the final results of the review. We find that creatine monohydrate from the People's Republic of China was not sold in the United States below normal value.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 11, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Blanche Ziv, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4207.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The 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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's ("the Department") regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

Background

On November 6, 2001, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of its administrative review of creatine monohydrate ("creatine") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") (*Creatine Monohydrate from the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 66 FR 56054 (November 6, 2001) ("*Preliminary Results*"). We received a case brief from the respondent, Blue Science International Trading (Shanghai) Co., Ltd. ("Blue Science"), on December 6, 2001. The petitioners did not submit a case brief.

The Department has now completed the antidumping duty administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Order

The product covered by this order is creatine monohydrate, which is commonly referred to as "creatine." The chemical name for creatine monohydrate is N-(aminoiminomethyl)-N-methylglycine monohydrate. The Chemical Abstracts Service ("CAS") registry number for this product is 6020-87-7. Creatine monohydrate in its pure form is a white, tasteless, odorless powder, that is a naturally occurring metabolite found in muscle tissue. Creatine monohydrate is provided for in subheading 2925.20.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheading and the CAS registry number are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Period of Review

The period of review ("POR") is from July 30, 1999 through January 31, 2001.

Comparisons

We calculated export price and normal value based on the same methodology used in the *Preliminary Results* with the following exceptions:

- We have valued certain inputs using domestic prices in India rather than import prices;
- We have corrected a ministerial error made in valuing one input.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in Blue Science's case brief are addressed in the March 6, 2002, Issues and Decision Memorandum ("Decision Memorandum") which is hereby adopted by this notice. Attached to this notice as an appendix is a list of the issues which Blue Science has raised and to which we have responded in the Decision Memorandum. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the Department. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/summary/list.htm>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of the Review

We will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate entries of the subject