were evaluated in field trials conducted under APHIS permits in 1992 and 1993, and under APHIS notifications in 1993 and 1994. In the process of reviewing the applications for those field trials, APHIS determined that these plants would not present a risk of plant pest introduction or dissemination.

In the Federal Plant Pest Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 150aa et seq.), "plant pest" is defined as "any living stage of: Any insect, mites, nematodes, slugs, snails, protozoa, or other invertebrate animals, bacteria, fungi, other parasitic plants or reproductive parts thereof, viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, or any infectious substances, which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any plants or parts thereof, or any processed, manufactured or other products of plants." APHIS views this definition very broadly. The definition covers direct or indirect injury, disease or damage not just to agricultural crops, but also to plants in general, for example, native species, as well as to organisms that may be beneficial to plants, for example, honeybees, rhizobia, etc.

Several issues associated with GRC Events T14 and T25 are also currently subject to regulation by other agencies. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is responsible for the regulation of pesticides under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended (7 U.S.C. 135 et seq.). FIFRA requires that all pesticides, including herbicides, be registered prior to distribution or sale, unless exempt by regulation. Plants that have been genetically modified for tolerance or resistant to herbicides are not regulated under FIFRA because the plants themselves are not themselves considered pesticides.

In cases in which the genetically modified plants allow for a new use of an herbicide or involve a different use pattern for the herbicide, EPA must approve the new or different use. In conducting such an approval, EPA considers the possibility of adverse effects to human health and the environment from the use of this herbicide.

When the use of the herbicide on the genetically modified plant would result in an increase in the residues of the herbicide in a food or feed crop for which the herbicide is currently registered, or in new residues in a crop for which the herbicide is not currently registered, establishment of a new tolerance or a revision of the existing tolerance would be required. Residue tolerances for pesticides are established by the EPA under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FEDCA) (21 U.S.C. 201 *et seq.*), and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) enforces tolerances set by the EPA under the FFDCA.

The FDA publishes a statement of policy on foods derived from new plant varities in the Federal Register on May 29, 1992 (57 FR 22984–23005). The FDA statement of policy includes a discussion of the FDA's authority for ensuring food safety under the FFDCA, and provides guidance to industry on the scientific considerations associated with the development of foods derived from new plant varities, including those developed through the techniques of genetic engineering.

In accordance with § 340.6(d) of the regulations, we are publishing this notice to inform the public that APHIS will accept written comments regarding the Petition for Determination of Nonregulated Status from any interested person for a period of 60 days from the date of this notice. The petition and any comments received are available for public review, and copies of the petition may be ordered (see the "ADDRESSES" section of this notice).

After the comment period closes, APHIS will review the data submitted by the petitioner, all written comments received during the comment period, and any other relevant information. Based on the available information, APHIS will furnish a response to the petitioner, either approving the petition in whole or in part, or denying the petition. APHIS will then publish a notice in the Federal Register announcing the regulatory status of AgrEvo's GRC Events T14 and T25 and the availability of APHIS' written decision.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 150aa–150jj, 151–167, and 1622n; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.17, 2.51, and 371.2(c).

Done in Washington, DC, this 21st day of February 1995.

Terry L. Medley,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 95-4741 Filed 2-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-M

# DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### International Trade Administration

[A-427-813]

### Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From France

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 27, 1995. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Penelope Naas or Gary Bettger, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3534 or 482–2239, respectively.

#### **Final Determination**

We determine that certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from France are being sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the "Act"). The estimated margin is shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

## Case History

Since the publication of the preliminary determination in the Federal Register on October 4, 1994 (59 FR 50565), the following events have occurred:

On October 5, 1994, pursuant to § 353.20(b)(1) of the Department's regulations, Interfit, S.A. ("Interfit"), requested that the final determination in this case be postponed. On November 14, 1994, the Department published in the Federal Register a notice postponing the publication of the final determination in this case no later than February 16, 1995 (59 FR 56461).

From October 10 through October 14, 1994, we verified the responses of Interfit at its offices in Maubeuge, France and Starval in Marly La Ville, France, respectively. On October 17, 1994, we conducted a verification of related party and certain other issues at Vallourec Group Headquarters in Boulogne-Bilancourt, France. During the period of December 20 to 21, 1994, we verified the responses of Interfit, Starval and Vallourec Inc. in Houston, Texas. From December 12 to December 16, 1994, we verified Interfit's cost of production data at its offices in Maubeuge.

On January 23, 1995, and on January 30, 1995, petitioner and respondent submitted case and rebuttal briefs to the