

is determined to be appropriate. Range improvements may be necessary to make this conversion. The conflict between domestic and bighorn sheep is a virus that can be transmitted from domestic sheep if they come in contact with bighorn sheep. A forest plan amendment will be necessary to modify management direction for range management within Management Area 16, Borah Peak.

#### Possible Alternatives

No Grazing and No Action alternatives will be analyzed to the proposed action during the NEPA process. The No Grazing alternative would eliminate domestic livestock grazing on allotments. The No Action alternative would allow continued livestock grazing as it is currently being managed. Other alternatives, arising from issues identified through scoping, could be analyzed as well.

#### Responsible Official

George Matejko, Forest Supervisor, 50 Hwy 93 South, Salmon, ID 83467.

#### Nature of Decision To Be Made

The Forest Supervisor will decide whether to authorize continued livestock grazing on the allotments' suitable rangelands in accordance with the standards in the proposed action or as modified by additional mitigation measures and monitoring requirements. The proposed action, or as modified by this analysis, will require a Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Amendment.

#### Scoping Process

This analysis is for twenty-one grazing allotments. The decision will have limited environmental effects outside the allotment boundaries, and the economic impacts are localized. Scoping will include:

- Review scoping comments from previous efforts
- Publish notice in the Challis Messenger and Salmon Recorder Herald, the newspapers of record, and the Arco Advertiser, another local newspaper, announcing the public meeting and requesting comments
- Mail scoping letters to interested public and grazing permittees describing the proposed action and preliminary issues
- Conduct public meeting in Arco, Idaho on August 19, 2003
- Notify consulting agencies and request comments
- Publish in the Quarterly Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) notice and mail to interested individuals and

groups, and put on the Forest's internet site

- Contact and consult with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes

A public meeting is scheduled for August 19, 2003 at 6 p.m. at the Arco-Butte Business Center, 159 N Idaho, Arco, Idaho.

#### Preliminary Issues

Concerns identified internally and from previous scoping include:

- Riparian and aquatic habitat
- Terrestrial wildlife
- Effects to other Forest users
- Effects on vegetation structure and composition
- Tribal Treaty Rights

#### Comment Requested

This notice of intent initiates the scoping process which guides the development of the environmental impact statement. Substantive comments and objections to the proposed action will be considered during this analysis.

*Early Notice of Importance of Public Participation in Subsequent Environmental Review:* A draft environmental impact statement will be prepared for comment. 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, at this early stage, 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). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental impact statement stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 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 on the proposed action, 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, including the names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposal and will be available for public inspection.

(Authority: 40 CFR 1501.7 and 1508.22; Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, Section 21)

Dated: July 24, 2003.

**Lyle E. Powers,**

*Acting Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 03-19481 Filed 7-30-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Klamath Provincial Advisory Committee (PAC)

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Klamath Provincial Advisory Committee will meet on August 13-14, 2003, at Shasta College, 11555 Old Oregon Trail, Redding, California. The meeting will start at 1 p.m. and adjourn at 5 p.m. on August 13, and start at 8 a.m. and adjourn at 12 noon on August 14. Agenda items for the meeting include: (1) Discussion on topics of general interest to the PAC (Implementation Monitoring Field Trips); (2) Stewardship Contracting; (3) Vegetative Treatments in Late Successional Reserves; (4) Burning for Cultural Benefits; and (5) Public Comment Periods. All Provincial Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public. Interested citizens are encouraged to attend.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jan Ford, USDA, Klamath National Forest, 1312 Fairlane Road, Yreka, California 96097; telephone 530-841-4483 (voice), TDD 530-841-4573.

Dated: July 24, 2003.

**Margaret J. Boland,**

*Designated Federal Official, Klamath PAC.*

[FR Doc. 03-19476 Filed 7-30-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-847]

#### **Persulfates From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on persulfates from the People's Republic of China in response to a request by the petitioner, FMC Corporation, and one exporter of subject merchandise, Shanghai Ai Jian Import and Export Corporation. The period of review is July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002.

We have preliminarily determined that U.S. sales have been made at not less than normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess no antidumping duties on the exports subject to this review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 31, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mike Strollo or Gregory E. Kalbaugh, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group I, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0629 and (202) 482-3693, respectively.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

On July 2, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order on persulfates from the People's Republic of China (PRC) covering the period July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 67 FR 44172 (July 1, 2002).

On July 31, 2002, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), the petitioner, FMC Corporation, requested an administrative review of Shanghai Ai

Jian Import & Export Corporation. In addition, on July 31, 2002, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.222(b), Shanghai Ai Jian Import and Export Corporation and Shanghai Ai Jian Reagent Works (collectively, Ai Jian) requested an administrative review. In its request for an administrative review, Ai Jian also requested that the Department partially revoke the antidumping duty order on persulfates with respect to Ai Jian's sales of subject merchandise. We published a notice of initiation of this review on August 27, 2002. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 67 FR 55000 (August 27, 2002) (Persulfates Initiation).

On August 1, 2002, we issued an antidumping questionnaire to Ai Jian. We received Ai Jian's timely responses to sections A, C and D of the questionnaire on October 15, 2002.

We issued a supplemental questionnaire to Ai Jian on December 10, 2002. We received Ai Jian's response to this supplemental questionnaire on January 6, 2003.

On January 10, 2003, the petitioner submitted publicly available information for consideration in valuing the factors of production. On January 17, 2003, Ai Jian provided rebuttal comments regarding the surrogate values submitted by the petitioner.

On February 12, 2003, we issued a second supplemental questionnaire to Ai Jian.

On February 19, 2003, the petitioners submitted information regarding the purported impact revocation of the antidumping duty order on Ai Jian would have upon the domestic industry.

On February 27, 2003, Ai Jian submitted a response to the second supplemental questionnaire.

On March 11, 2003, we issued a third supplemental questionnaire to Ai Jian. Ai Jian submitted its response on March 19, 2003.

Also, on March 19, 2003, Ai Jian withdrew its request for revocation. Accordingly, we have not considered this request further in this segment of the proceeding.

##### **Scope of Review**

The products covered by this review are persulfates, including ammonium, potassium, and sodium persulfates. The chemical formula for these persulfates are, respectively,  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_8$ ,  $\text{K}_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_8$ , and  $\text{Na}_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_8$ . Potassium persulfates are currently classifiable under subheading 2833.40.10 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). Sodium persulfates are classifiable under HTSUS subheading 2833.40.20.

Ammonium and other persulfates are classifiable under HTSUS subheadings 2833.40.50 and 2833.40.60. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this review is dispositive.

##### **Separate Rates**

It is the Department's policy to assign all exporters of the merchandise subject to review in non-market-economy (NME) countries a single rate, unless an exporter can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to exports. To establish whether an exporter is sufficiently independent of government control to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes the exporter in light of the criteria established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers From the People's Republic of China*, 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991) (*Sparklers*), as amplified in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide From the People's Republic of China*, 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994) (*Silicon Carbide*). Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of de jure absence of government control over export activities includes: (1) An absence of restrictive stipulations associated with an individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and (3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. With respect to evidence of a de facto absence of government control, the Department considers the following four factors: (1) Whether the respondent sets its own export prices independently from the government and other exporters; (2) whether the respondent can retain the proceeds from its export sales; (3) whether the respondent has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts; and (4) whether the respondent has autonomy from the government regarding the selection of management. See *Silicon Carbide*, 59 FR at 22587; see also *Sparklers*, 56 FR at 20589.

With respect to Ai Jian, for purposes of our final results covering the period of review (POR) July 1, 2000, through June 30, 2001, the Department determined that there was an absence of de jure and de facto government control of its export activities and determined that it warranted a company-specific dumping margin. See *Persulfates From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 6712, (February 10, 2003) (*Persulfates Fourth*