

**Douglas County**

35-DO-130—Tahkenitch Landing Site, (Native American Archeological Sites of the Oregon Coast MPS) Address Restricted, Gardiner, 01000132

**Lincoln County**

35-LNC-76—The Ahnkuti Site, (Native American Archeological Sites of the Oregon Coast MPS) Address Restricted, Toledo, 01000133

**Multnomah County**

Ambruster, Frederick, Cottage, (Eliot Neighborhood MPS) 502 NE Tillamock, Portland, 01000130

Benson, Simon, House, Jct. of SW Montgomery and SW Ninth, Portland, 01000155

Laurelhurst Park, (City Beautiful Movement and Civic Planning in Portland, Oregon MPS) 3554 SE Ankeny St., Portland, 01000134

**Tillamook County**

35-TI-4—Cronin Point Site, (Native American Archeological Sites of the Oregon Coast MPS) Address Restricted, Manzanita, 01000128

35-TI-75—Spruce Tree Site, (Native American Archeological Sites of the Oregon Coast MPS) Address Restricted, Manzanita, 01000127

35-TI-76—North Trail House Site, (Native American Archeological Sites of the Oregon Coast MPS) Address Restricted, Manzanita, 01000129

Archeological Site 35-TI-40, (Native American Archeological Sites of the Oregon Coast MPS) Address Restricted, Netarts, 01000136

**PENNSYLVANIA****Carbon County**

Summit Hill High School, 124 W. Hazard St., Summit Hill, 01000138

**TENNESSEE****Obion County**

Central Elementary School, (Union City, Tennessee MPS) 512 East College St., Union City, 01000141

Mt. Zion Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, (Union City, Tennessee MPS) 105 N. Greenwood, Union City, 01000140

**VIRGINIA****Alexandria Independent city**

Presbyterian Meeting House, Old, 321 S. Fairfax St., Alexandria (Independent City), 01000143

**Bedford County**

Otterburn, Big Island Rd., Bedford, 01000146

**Charlotte County**

Gravel Hill, 3990 Fearstown Rd., Charlotte Court House, 01000150

**Charlottesville Independent city**

Abell—Gleason House, 521 N. First St., Charlottesville (Independent City), 01000151

**Clarke County**

Smithfield Farm, 568 Smithfield Ln., Berryville, 01000148

**Culpeper County**

Croftburn Farm, 18175 Croftsburn Farm Rd., Culpeper, 01000153  
Eckington School, Jct. of VA 658 and VA 661, Culpeper, 01000154

**Fairfax Independent city**

Blenheim, 3610 Old Lee Hwy., Fairfax (Independent City), 01000152

**Fluvanna County**

Rivanna Farm, Rte. 1., Breno Bluff, 01000147

**Frederick County**

Opequon Presbyterian Church, 217 Opequon Church Ln., Winchester, 01000145

**Montgomery County**

Long, Edgar A., Building, 140 Scattergood Dr., Christianburg, 01000149

**Pittsylvania County**

Craft, Phillip, House, 1381 Old Red Eye Rd., Chatham, 01000144

**Rockingham County**

Kyle's Mill House, 1764 Cross Keys Rd., Harrisonburg, 01000142

A request for REMOVAL has been made for the following resource:

**OREGON****Multnomah County**

1504 SW 11th Ave. Portland, 83002167

[FR Doc. 01-2641 Filed 1-30-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR****National Park Service**

**Proposed World War II Memorial; Notice to the Public of the Secretary of the Interior's Response to Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Comments, and Notice of the Availability of the Record**

**AGENCY:** National Capital Region, National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice to the public of the Secretary of the Interior's response to Advisory Council on Historic Preservation comments, and notice of the availability of the record.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.7(c)(4)(iii) (1999), the public is notified that on September 13, 2000, the Secretary of the Interior (the Secretary) responded to the September 5, 2000, comments of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Advisory Council), about the proposed World War II Memorial. The Secretary advised the Advisory Council, in accordance with 36 CFR 800.7(c)(4)(i) (1999), that its

comments have been taken into account pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and attached the detailed response of the National Park Service.

The Advisory Council is concerned primarily with two issues. First, it is concerned with the approach taken by the Department of the Interior/National Park Service (the NPS), to Section 106 and what it sees as the limited nature of public involvement in the site and design selection process. Second, the Advisory Council believes the current design does not achieve the strict standard of compatibility with the historic setting of the National Mall.

The Secretary and the NPS believe the requirements of Section 106 have been met. In February 1996, the NPS contacted the Advisory Council and the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Officer (DCHPO) about the proposed Memorial. In 1997 the NPS submitted the original design concept to the Advisory Council and DCHPO and invited the Advisory Council to consult. In 1998, the NPS began consultation with the Advisory Council on the revised design. This process continued until July 2000 and resulted in a Memorandum of Agreement between the NPS, the DCHPO, and the American Battle Monuments Commission (ABMC). The Advisory Council, however, did not sign this agreement, choosing instead to provide comments pursuant to Section 800.7 of the Advisory Council regulations (36 CFR 800.7 (1999)).

The Secretary and the NPS believe that the publication of notices about actions taken on this Memorial (and invitations for public comments) in the **Federal Register**, and numerous meetings about the Memorial to which the public was invited, provided extensive opportunities for public participation in the site and design selection process. The NPS is, however, seriously evaluating the Advisory Council's suggestion to further expand the public discussion on national memorials and expects to engage in discussions with the Advisory Council in this regard.

In its September 5, 2000, comments, the Advisory Council expressed concern with three aspects of the current design: (1) Its scale and impact on vistas, (2) the lighting plan, and (3) the proposed sculptural element.

Following initial consideration of the Advisory Council's September 5, 2000, comments and its corresponding response to the Advisory Council, the Secretary and the NPS have continued to consider the Advisory Council's comments on those occasions this Fall

when the Memorial was before the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, and prior to the NPS' issuance of a construction permit for the Memorial.

It is the view of the NPS that the scale of the Memorial is appropriate and that it will maintain the transparency of the historic landscape without blocking vistas. The NPS also understands the Advisory Council's concerns about lighting. Based on its experience with other commemorative works, the NPS believes the correct intensity of lighting can best be determined after completion of the Memorial. The NPS will act in concert with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission to resolve any lighting concerns. Concerning the third point, there has been no final decision as to whether a sculptural element will be included in the Rainbow Pool. If such an element is included it will be subject to design parameters that will ensure that it does not intrude on any vistas and the design concept will be considered by all relevant approval bodies at the appropriate time.

The Secretary and the NPS believe the process for this commemorative work has complied with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Commemorative Works Act, and other applicable laws, and has taken the Advisory Council's comments into account. The NPS nevertheless is committed to working with the Advisory Council to address the Counsel's interest in further modifying the Section 106 process in the context of future proposed commemorative works.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The record for this decision is available for public inspection at the Office of Lands, Resources and Planning, National Capital Region, National Park Service, 1100 Ohio Drive, SW., Room 220, Washington, DC 20242. Copies of the response to the Advisory Council are also available upon request from Mr. John G. Parsons, Associate Regional Director for Lands, Resources and Planning. Individuals requiring further information should contact Mr. John G. Parsons, Associate Regional Director for Lands, Resources and Planning, National Capital Region, National Park Service, 1100 Ohio Drive, SW., Room 220, Washington, DC 20242.

Dated: January 17, 2001.

**Terry R. Carlstrom,**  
Regional Director, National Capital Region.  
[FR Doc. 01-2642 Filed 1-30-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-70-M**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

### Investigations Nos. 731-TA-624-625 (Review)

#### Helical Spring Lock Washers From China and Taiwan

##### Determinations

On the basis of the record <sup>1</sup> developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission determines,<sup>2</sup> pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on helical spring lock washers from China and Taiwan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

##### Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on November 2, 1999 (64 FR 59204) and determined on February 3, 2000, that it would conduct full reviews (65 FR 7890, February 16, 2000). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's reviews and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on July 25, 2000 (65 FR 45801). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on November 30, 2000, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these reviews to the Secretary of Commerce on January 25, 2001. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3384 (January 2001), entitled Helical Spring Lock Washers from China and Taiwan: Investigations Nos. 731-TA-624-625 (Review).

Issued: January 25, 2001.

By order of the Commission.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-2690 Filed 1-30-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

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

<sup>2</sup> Vice Chairman Okun and Commissioner Miller dissenting with respect to Taiwan; Commissioner Askey not participating.

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

### [Investigations Nos. 701-TA-409-412 and 731-TA-909-912 (Preliminary)]

#### Low Enriched Uranium From France, Germany, The Netherlands, and the United Kingdom

##### Determinations

On the basis of the record <sup>1</sup> developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission determines, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673(b)(a)),<sup>2</sup> that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is threatened with materially injury by reason of imports from France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom of low enriched uranium, that are alleged to be subsidized by the Governments of France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom and that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV).

##### Commencement of the Final Phase Investigations

Pursuant to section 207.18 of the Commission's rules, the Commission also gives notice of the commencement of the final phase of its investigations. The Commission will issue a final phase notice of scheduling which will be published in the **Federal Register** as provided in section 207.21 of the Commission's rules upon notice from the Department of Commerce (Commerce) of affirmative preliminary determinations in the investigations under section 703(b) and 733(b) of the Act, or, if the preliminary determinations are negative, upon notice of affirmative final determinations in these investigations under section 705(a) and 735(a) of the Act. Parties that filed entries of appearance in the preliminary phase of the investigations need not enter a separate appearance for the final phase of the investigations. Industrial users, and, if the merchandise under investigation is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations have the right to appear as parties in Commission antidumping and countervailing duty investigations. The Secretary will prepare a public service list containing the names and addresses

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

<sup>2</sup> Vice Chairman Okun and Commissioner Devaney not participating.