

Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3).

In addition, Federal court decisions have established that 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 reviewers' position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Corp. v. NRDC* 435 US 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. *City of Angoon v. Hodel* 9th Circuit, 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc v. Harris*, 490F. Supp.1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). The reason for this is to ensure that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when they can meaningfully consider them in the final environmental impact statement.

Dated: January 31, 2002.

John C. Bedell,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 02-3394 Filed 2-12-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Lake County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC)

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Lake County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) will hold its second meeting.

DATES: The meeting will be held on February 28, 2002, from 3 P.M. to 6 P.M.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Lake County Board of Supervisor's Chambers at 255 North Forbes Street, Lakeport.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Debbie McIntosh, Committee Coordinator, USDA, Mendocino National Forest, Upper Lake Ranger District, 10025 Elk Mountain Road, Upper Lake, CA 95485, (707) 275-2361; EMAIL dmcintosh@fs.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Agenda items to be covered include: (1) Review and approval of the minutes of the January meeting; (2) Title II and Title III dollars—County input; (3) Evaluation Criteria; (4) Project Proposals/Ideas; and (5) Public Comment. The meeting is open to the public. Public input opportunity will be provided and

individuals will have the opportunity to address the Committee at that time.

Dated: February 4, 2002.

Blaine P. Baker,

Designated Federal Officer.

[FR Doc. 02-3487 Filed 2-12-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Export Administration

Action Affecting Export Privileges; Federal Parts International, Inc.; Order

In the Matter of: Federal Parts International, Inc., 5455 Peachtree Industrial Blvd., Norcross, Georgia 30092, Respondent.

The Bureau of Export Administration, United States Department of Commerce (BXA), having initiated an administrative proceeding against Federal Parts International, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as Federal Parts) pursuant to section 13(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. secs. 2401-2420 (1994 & Supp. V. 1999) (The "Act")¹ and the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR parts 730-774 (20012) (the "Regulations"),² based on allegations that, on two separate occasions, between on or about January 30, 1996 and on or about February 14, 1996, Federal Parts exported U.S.-origin auto parts from the United States to Iran in violation of § 787.6 of the former regulations; that, in connection with the January 30, 1996 shipment, Federal Parts violated the provisions of § 787.5(a) of the former regulations by making a false or misleading statement of material fact directly or indirectly to a United States government agency in connection with the preparation, submission, issuance or use or an export

control document; that, on two separate occasions, on or about March 27, 1996 and on or about April 2, 1996, Federal Parts attempted to export from the United States to Iran U.S.-origin auto parts in violation of §§ 787.3(a) and 787.4(a) of the former regulations; and that on or about April 2, 1996, Federal Parts violated the provisions of § 785.5(a) of the former regulations by making false or misleading statements of material fact either directly to BXA or indirectly through any other person for the purpose of or in connection with the preparation, submission, issuance, use or maintenance or an export control document;

BXA and Federal Parts having entered into a Settlement Agreement pursuant to § 766.18(b) of the regulations whereby they agreed to settle this matter in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth therein, and the terms of the Settlement Agreement having been approved by me:

It is therefore ordered:

First, that a civil penalty of \$50,000 is assessed against Federal Parts. Federal Parts shall pay \$10,000 of the civil penalty to the U.S. Department of Commerce within 30 days from the date of entry of this Order. Payment of the remaining \$40,000 shall be made in four equal, monthly installments of \$10,000 beginning on the first day of the second month after the date of entry of this Order. Payment shall be made in the manner specified in the attached instructions.

Second, that, pursuant to the Debt Collection Act of 1982, as amended (31 U.S.C. 3701-3720E (1983 and Supp. V 1999)), the civil penalty owed under this Order accrues interest as more fully described in the attached Notice, and, if payment is not made by the due date specified herein, Federal Parts will be assessed, in addition to interest, a penalty charge and an administrative charge, as more fully described in the attached Notice.

Third, Federal Parts International, Inc., 5455 Peachtree Industrial Blvd., Norcross, Georgia 30092, ("the denied person") and, when acting in behalf of it, all of its successors or assigns, officers, representatives, agents and employees, may not, for a period of 10 years from the date of this Order, participate, directly or indirectly, 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 EAR, or in any other activity subject to the regulations, including, but not limited to:

¹ From August 21, 1994 through November 12, 2000, the Act was in lapse. During that period, the President, through Executive Order 12924, which had been extended by successive Presidential Notices, the last of which was August 3, 2000 (3 CFR, 2000 Comp. 397 (2001)), continued the regulations then in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701-1706 (1994 & Supp. IV 1999)) (IEEPA). On November 13, 2000, the Act was reauthorized and it remained in effect through August 20, 2001. Since August 21, 2001, the Act has been in lapse and the President, through Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 (66 FR 44025 (August 22, 2001)), has continued the regulations in effect under IEEPA.

² The alleged violations occurred in 1996. The Regulations governing the violations at issue are found in the 1996 version of the Code of Federal Regulations (15 CFR parts 768-799 (1996)). Those regulations define the violations that BXA alleges occurred and are referred to hereinafter as the former regulations. Since that time, the Regulations have been reorganized and restructured; the restructured regulations establish the procedures that apply to this matter.

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 Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations; or

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

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

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the denied person any item subject to the Regulations;

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

D. Obtain from the denied person in the United States any item subject to the regulations 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 Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Fifth, that after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in § 766.23 of the regulations, any person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to Federal Parts by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct

of trade or related services may also be subject to the provisions of this Order.

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

Seventh, that a copy of this Order shall be delivered to the United States Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022, notifying that office that this case is withdrawn from adjudication, as provided by § 766.18(b) of the regulations.

Eighth, that the Charging Letter, the Settlement Agreement, and this Order shall be made available to the public.

This Order, which constitutes the final agency action in this matter, is effective immediately.

Entered this 5th day of February, 2002.

Michael J. Garcia.

Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 02-3453 Filed 2-12-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket No. 7-2002]

Foreign-Trade Zone 153—San Diego, CA Application for Expansion

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) by the City of San Diego, California, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 153, requesting authority to expand FTZ 153, San Diego, California, within the San Diego Customs port of entry. The application was submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR Part 400). It was formally filed on January 30, 2002.

FTZ 153 was approved on October 14, 1988 (Board Order 394, 53 FR 41616, 10/24/88) and expanded on December 16, 1991 (Board Order 548, 56 FR 67057, 12/27/91). The zone project currently consists of seven sites within the City's Otay Mesa industrial area: *Site 1* (316 acres)—at Brown Field, Otay Mesa and Heritage Roads; *Site 2* (73 acres)—San Diego Business Park, Airway Road and State Route 125; *Site 3* (60 acres)—Gateway Park, Harvest and Customs House Plaza Roads; *Site 4* (71 acres)—Britannia Commerce Center, Siempre Viva Road and Britannia Boulevard; *Site 5* (312 acres)—De La Fuente Business Park, Airway and Media Roads; *Site 5A*

(119 acres)—Siempre Viva Business Park, adjacent to Site 5 (De La Fuente Business Park), along La Media and Siempre Viva Roads; *Site 6* (160 acres)—Brown Field Business Park, Otay Mesa Road and Britannia Boulevard; *Site 6A* (65 acres)—Brown Field Technology Park, adjacent to Site 6 (Brown Field Business Park), across Otay Mesa Road from Brown Field; and, *Site 7* (389 acres)—Otay International Center, Harvest and Airway Roads.

The applicant is now requesting authority to expand the general-purpose zone to include an additional site (Proposed Site 8) in the Otay Mesa area of San Diego. *Proposed Site 8* (86 acres)—Ocean View Hills Corporate Center, Otay Mesa Road and Innovative Drive, San Diego. The site is owned by four private companies. Metro International is the proposed operator of the site. No specific manufacturing authority is being requested at this time. Such requests would be made to the Board on a case-by-case basis.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment on the application is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at one of the following addresses:

1. Submissions via Express/Package Delivery Services: Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Franklin Court Building-Suite 4100W, 1099-14th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005; or

2. Submissions via the U.S. Postal Service: Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, FCB—Suite 4100W, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230.

The closing period for their receipt is April 15, 2002. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period April 29, 2002.

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available during this time for public inspection at the City of San Diego, 600 B Street, 4th Floor-Suite 400, San Diego, California 92101.

Dated: February 1, 2002.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-3535 Filed 2-12-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P