

environmental assessment (EA) is the appropriate means to serve as the analysis and the basis for decisions on lands identified in the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 for public land management.

The following resource-related issues have been identified: (1) Off Highway Vehicle use; (2) public access (hunting, ranching, mining claims, etc.); (3) livestock grazing; (4) sage grouse habitat preservation; (5) Pony Express Trail protection; (6) wildfire prevention and suppression. The BLM and Navy are soliciting comments regarding issues and concerns the public may have.

EFFECTIVE DATES: Two public scoping meetings will be held in June 2000 to allow the public an opportunity to identify issues and concerns to be addressed in the RMP Amendment. Representatives from BLM and Navy will be available to answer questions about the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 and the RMP Amendment process. Comments will be accepted until June 30, 2000.

The scheduled public meetings are:
Fallon, NV (7:00–9:00 p.m.)—June 13, 2000, Fallon Convention Center, 100 Campus Way, Fallon, NV.
Reno, NV (7–9 p.m.)—June 15, 2000, BLM Nevada State Office, 1340 Financial Blvd., Reno, NV.

The proposed plan amendment schedule is as follows:

Begin Public Scoping: May 25, 2000.
Public Scoping Meetings: June 13 and 15, 2000.
Release Proposed Plan Amendment, EA and FONSI for Public Review, Governor's Consistency Review: November 30, 2000.
Issue Plan Amendment and Decision Record: May 1, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scoping comments may be sent to: Field Manager, Bureau of Land Management, 5665 Morgan Mill Road, Carson City, NV 89701. ATTN: Navy Project Manager.

For additional information, write to the above address or call Terri Knutson (BLM Project Manager) at (775) 885–6156 or email tknutson@nv.blm.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In 1998 the Navy completed an environmental impact statement (EIS) to analyze the proposed withdrawal of public lands to provide safety and training buffers around three established training ranges in Churchill County, Nevada. The Findings and Recommendations resulting from the EIS were transmitted to Congress and in October 1999 the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999, Public Law 106–65 was passed and

signed by the President. The Act specifies several actions to be taken by the BLM and Navy prior to October 2001, including development of a plan for management of each area withdrawn for protection of the resources and values. Federal, state, and local agencies, Tribal entities, and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in or affected by the decisions to be made in this plan amendment are invited to participate in the scoping process and may request, or be requested by the BLM and Navy, to participate as a cooperating agency.

Dated: May 15, 2000.

John O. Singlaub,

Manager, Carson City Field Office.

[FR Doc. 00–13164 Filed 5–25–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–HC–U

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–434]

Notice of Investigation

In the Matter of: Certain Magnetic Resonance Injection Systems and Components Thereof.

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of investigation pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on April 25, 2000, and supplemented on May 10, 2000 and May 17, 2000, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Medrad, Inc., One Medrad Drive, Indianola, Pennsylvania 15051–0780. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain magnetic resonance injection systems, components thereof, and molds therefor by reason of infringement of claims 8–9, 22, 25–28, 30–31, and 33–39 of U.S. Letters Patent Re. 36,648. The complaint further alleges that there exists an industry in the United States as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after a hearing, issue a permanent exclusion order and permanent cease and desist orders.

ADDRESSES: The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, is available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m.

to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jeffrey R. Whieldon, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–2580. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in § 210.10 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (1999).

SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on May 19, 2000, ordered that:

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain magnetic resonance injection systems and components thereof by reason of infringement of claims 8–9, 22, 25–28, 30–31, or 33–39 of U.S. Letters Patent Re. 36,648, and whether there exists an industry in the United States as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is: Medrad, Inc., One Medrad Drive, Indianola, Pennsylvania 15051–0780.

(b) The respondents are the following companies alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

Nemoto Kyorindo Co., Ltd., 3–26–4 Hongo Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
Liebel-Flarsheim Co., 2111 E. Galbraith Road, Cincinnati, OH 45215–6305
Mallinckrodt Inc., (New York corporation), 675 McDonnell Boulevard, Hazelwood, MO 63042.

Mallinckrodt Inc., (Delaware corporation), 675 McDonnell Boulevard, Hazelwood, MO 63042.

(c) Jeffrey R. Whieldon, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Room 401-H, Washington, DC 20436, who shall be the Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Paul J. Luckern is designated as the presiding administrative law judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with § 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d) and 210.13(a) of the Commission's rules, such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter both an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of a limited exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against such respondent.

Issued: May 22, 2000.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-13269 Filed 5-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-856 (Final)]

Certain Ammonium Nitrate From Russia

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Cancellation of hearing, posthearing briefs, and final comments.

SUMMARY: On May 19, 2000, the Department of Commerce informed the Commission that a suspension agreement had been signed in the subject investigation. Accordingly, the Commission hereby cancels the hearing on the investigation currently scheduled for May 25, 2000, the posthearing briefs currently due on June 1, 2000, and the final comments currently due on June 22, 2000. The Commission unanimously determined that no earlier announcement of this cancellation was possible.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 22, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Karen Taylor (202-708-4101), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

Authority: This investigation is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.21 of the Commission's rules (19 CFR § 207.21).

Issued: May 22, 2000.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-13267 Filed 5-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 701-TA-318 (Review) and 731-TA-538 and 561 (Review)]

Sulfanilic Acid From China and India

Determinations

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1675(c)), that revocation of the countervailing duty and antidumping duty orders on sulfanilic acid from China and India would be likely to lead to continuation or

¹ The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR § 207.2(f)).

recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on October 1, 1999 (64 FR 53412, October 1, 1999) and determined on January 7, 2000 that it would conduct expedited reviews (65 FR 2645, January 18, 2000). The Commission transmitted its determinations in these reviews to the Secretary of Commerce on May 18, 2000. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3301 (May 2000), entitled Sulfanilic Acid From China and India: Investigations Nos. 701-TA-318 (Review) and 731-TA-538 and 561 (Review).

Issued: May 22, 2000.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-13268 Filed 5-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Agency Information Collection Activities; Current Collection; Comments Requests

AGENCY: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

ACTION: Notice of Information Collection Under Review; Extension of a Currently Approved Collection: Hate Crime Incident Report and Quarterly Hate Crime Report

The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until July 25, 2000.

Request written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information. Comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and