

roads would be constructed and decommissioned after use; 17 miles of existing roads would be closed; 15 miles of existing roads would be permanently decommissioned; and 117 miles of existing roads would be reconstructed to sustain project use and reduce water quality impacts.

#### Lead Agency

The USDA Forest Service is the lead agency for this proposal.

#### Responsible Official

Plumas National Forest Supervisor James M. Peña is the responsible official. Plumas National Forest, PO Box 11500, Quincy, CA 95971.

#### Nature of Decision To Be Made

Forest Supervisor James M. Peña will decide whether to implement the Empire Project as proposed and described above, implement the project based on an alternative to this proposal that is formulated to resolve identified conflicts, or not implement this project at this time.

#### Scoping Process

Public questions and comments regarding this proposal are an integral part of this environmental analysis process. Comments will be used to identify issues and develop alternatives to the proposed action. To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments should be as specific as possible.

A copy of the Proposed Action and/or summary of the Proposed Action will be mailed to adjacent landowners, as well as those people and organizations that have indicated a specific interest in the Empire project, individuals who attended the two open houses held prior to the development of a landscape assessment for the watersheds surrounding the project, people who sent in previous comments, to Native American entities, and federal, state, and local agencies. The public will be notified of any meetings regarding this proposal by mailings and press releases sent to the local newspaper and media. There are no meetings planned at this time.

#### Permits or Licenses Required

An Air Pollution Permit and a Smoke Management Plan are required by local agencies.

#### Comment

This notice of intent initiates the scoping process which guides the development of the environmental impact statement under NEPA, which

will guide development of the EIS. Our desire is to receive substantive comments on the merits of the Proposed Action, as well as comments that address errors, misinformation, or information that has been omitted. Substantive comments are defined as comments within the scope of the proposal, that have a direct relationship to the proposal, and that include supporting reasons for the Responsible Official's consideration.

#### 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 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: February 3, 2005.

**Terri Simon-Jackson**,  
*Acting Forest Supervisor*.

[FR Doc. 05-2494 Filed 2-8-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

---

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Notice of Southwest Idaho Resource Advisory Committee Meeting

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the authorities in the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463) and under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106-393), the Boise and Payette National Forests' Southwest Idaho Resource Advisory Committee will conduct a business meeting, which is open to the public.

**DATES:** Wednesday, February 16, 2005, beginning at 10:30 a.m.

**ADDRESSES:** Idaho Counties Risk Management Program Building, 3100 South Vista Avenue, Boise, Idaho.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Agenda topics will include review and approval of project proposals, and is an open public forum.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Doug Gochnour, Designated Federal Officer, at 208-392-6681 or e-mail [dgochnour@fs.fed.us](mailto:dgochnour@fs.fed.us).

Dated: January 3, 2005.

**Richard M. Christensen**,  
*Engineering, Lands, and Minerals Officer*,  
*Boise National Forest*.

[FR Doc. 05-2485 Filed 2-8-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

---

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Rural Utilities Service: North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation; Notice of Finding of No Significant Impact

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Finding of No Significant Impact.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) has made a Finding Of No Significant Impact with respect to a request from North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation for financing assistance from RUS to finance the construction of a 336 megawatt (MW), simple-cycle combustion turbine electric generating facility in Anson County North Carolina, and a 280 MW simple-cycle combustion turbine electric generation facility in Richmond County, North Carolina.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lawrence Wolfe, Engineering and Environmental Staff, RUS, Stop 1571, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-1571, telephone (202) 720-5093, e-mail [larry.wolfe@usda.gov](mailto:larry.wolfe@usda.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation proposes to construct and operate two simple-cycle combustion turbine electric generation projects. A 336 MW facility is proposed at a site located approximately 4 miles east of Lilesville, just to the north of Blewett Falls Road (SR 1745) and south of McCoy Creek in Anson County, North Carolina. Approximately 20 acres of the 178 acre site will be needed for the generation facility. The other project consists of a 280 MW facility proposed at a site approximately 2.54 miles southwest of Hamlet west of Airport Road and south of Marks Creek in Richmond County, North Carolina. Approximately 20 acres of the 258 acre site will be needed for the generation facility. This facility will also require the construction of 7.8 miles of 230 kV transmission line between the Rockingham Substation and the Richmond Substation. The transmission line will be constructed and operated by Progress Energy. North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation is expected to finance the cost of the project through an RUS guarantee. Specific information on the facilities to be constructed and their locations are provided in the environmental assessment.

Copies of the Finding of No Significant Impact are available from RUS at the address provided herein or from June Small, North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation, P.O. Box 27306, Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7306. Ms. Small may be contacted by telephone at (919) 872-0800 or e-mail at [june.small@ncemcs.com](mailto:june.small@ncemcs.com).

Dated: February 4, 2005.

**James R. Newby,**

*Assistant Administrator, Electric Program.*

[FR Doc. 05-2515 Filed 2-8-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-15-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-475-818]

#### Notice of Final Results of the Seventh Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Pasta from Italy and Determination to Revoke in Part

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

**SUMMARY:** On August 6, 2004, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results and partial rescission of the seventh administrative review and revocation of the antidumping duty order in part, for the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy. The review covers eight manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise: (1) Barilla Alimentare, S.p.A. (Barilla), (2) Corticella Molini e Pastifici S.p.A. (Corticella) and its affiliate Pasta Combattenti S.p.A. (Combattenti) (collectively, Corticella/Combattenti), (3) Pastificio Guido Ferrara S.r.l. (Ferrara), (4) Industria Alimentare Colavita, S.p.A. (Indalco) and its affiliate Fusco S.r.l. (Fusco) (collectively Indalco), (5) Pasta Lensi S.r.l. (Lensi), (6) PAM S.p.A. (PAM), (7) Pastificio Riscossa F. Illi Mastromauro, S.r.l. (Riscossa), and (8) Pastificio Carmine Russo S.p.A./Pastificio Di Nola S.p.A. (Russo). The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003.

As a result of our analysis of the comments received, these final results differ from the preliminary results. For our final results, we have found that during the POR, Barilla, Corticella/Combattenti, Indalco, PAM, Riscossa, and Russo sold subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV). We have also found that Ferrara and Lensi did not make sales of the subject merchandise at less than NV (*i.e.*, they have “zero” or *de minimis* dumping margins). We have also determined to revoke the antidumping duty order with respect to subject merchandise produced and also exported by Ferrara and Lensi because each company sold the subject merchandise at not less than NV for a period of at least three consecutive years. See 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2) and the “Revocation”

section of this notice. The final results are listed in the “Final Results of Review” section below.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 9, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mark Young, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-6397.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On August 6, 2004, the Department published the preliminary results of the seventh administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy. See *Notice of Preliminary Results, Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation of the Antidumping Duty Order in Part: For the Seventh Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Pasta from Italy*, 69 FR 47880 (August 6, 2004) (*Preliminary Results*). Although the Department initiated the review of fifteen companies, we rescinded the reviews of N. Puglisi & F. Industria Pasta Alimentari S.p.A. (Puglisi), La Molisana Industrie Alimentari S.p.a. (La Molisana), Molino e Pastificio Tomasello S.r.l. (Tomasello), Pastificio Antonio Pallante S.r.l. (Pallante) and Industrie Alimentari Molisane S.r.l. (IAM) (collectively Pallante/IAM), Pastificio Fratelli Pagani S.p.A. (Pagani), Rummo S.p.A. Molino e Pastificio (Rummo), and Pastificio Lucio Garofalo S.p.A. (Garofalo). See the “Background” and “Partial Rescission” section of the *Preliminary Results*, 69 FR at 47880, 47881. The review covers the remaining eight manufacturers/exporters: Barilla, Corticella/Combattenti, Ferrara, Indalco, Lensi, PAM, Riscossa, and Russo.

We invited parties to comment on our *Preliminary Results*. Petitioners<sup>1</sup> filed case briefs on September 7, 2004, regarding Barilla, Indalco, and Riscossa. Barilla, Indalco, PAM, Russo, Riscossa, and Lensi each filed case briefs on September 7, 2004. On September 13, 2004, petitioners submitted rebuttal briefs concerning Barilla and Indalco, and Barilla, Riscossa, and Indalco submitted rebuttal briefs. On October 6, 2004, a public hearing was held at the Department of Commerce with respect to Barilla. On November 4, 2004, the Department published the notice of extension of final results of the antidumping administrative review of pasta from Italy, extending the date for

<sup>1</sup> Petitioners are New World Pasta Company, Dakota Growers Pasta Company, Borden Foods Corporation and American Italian Pasta Company.