

populations in balance. Consequently, these undesirable weeds invade healthy ecosystems, displace native vegetation, reduce species diversity, and destroy wildlife habitat. Widespread infestations lead to soil erosion and stream sedimentation. Furthermore, noxious weed invasions weaken reforestation efforts, reduce domestic and wild ungulates grazing capacity, aggravate and occasionally injure forest visitors, and threaten federally protected plants and animals.

To curb the spread of noxious weeds, a growing number of Western states have jointly developed noxious weed-free forage certification standards and, in cooperation with various federal, state and county agencies, passed weed-control laws. Because hay and other forage products containing noxious weeds are part of the infestation problem, states have developed a hay inspection/certification/identification process and are encouraging forage producers to grow noxious weed-free products.

In cooperation with the states of Idaho and Montana, the U.S. Forest Service is proposing—for all National Forest System lands within Idaho and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness portion of the Bitterroot National Forest in Montana—a ban on hay, straw or mulch that has not been state certified. This proposal includes a public information plan to insure that: (1) this ban (a.k.a. closure order) is well publicized and understood; and (2) National Forest visitors will know where they can purchase state-certified hay or other products.

The Forest Service invites written comment and suggestions on this proposal. Written comments must be received with 30 days from the date of publication in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: July 25, 1995.

**Dale N. Bosworth,**

*Regional Forester, Intermountain Region.*

**John M. Hughes,**

*Deputy Regional Forester, Northern Region.*

**John E. Lowe,**

*Regional Forester, Pacific Northwest Region.*  
[FR Doc. 95-18710 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Export Administration

[Docket No. 5101-01]

#### **Lucach Corporation, Respondent and Golamreza Zandianjazi, Also Known as Reza Zandian**

#### *Related Parties; Final Decision and Order*

Respondent Lucach Corporation ("Lucach") is charged with violating § 787.5(a) and § 787.6 of the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR Parts 768-799 (1995)) ("the Regulations"), issued pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C.A. app. §§ 2401-2410 (1991, Supp. 1993, and Public Law 103-277, July 5, 1994)) ("the Act"). Specifically, the Office of Export Enforcement, Bureau of Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce (Department) alleges that Lucach exported a U.S.-origin computer system (an IBM RISC System 6000 Model 520H) from the United States to Iran without the required validated export license. In addition, Lucach is alleged to have made a false or misleading statement of material fact in connection with the preparation and use of a Shipper's Export Declaration.

On June 29, 1995, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued his recommended Decision and Order, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof. On the basis of the Department's default submission and all of the supporting evidence presented, the ALJ found that Lucach committed the violations alleged in the Charging Letter issued against it on December 6, 1993. The ALJ also found that Golamreza Zandianjazi, also known as Reza Zandian, is related to Lucach by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services. Accordingly, the ALJ ordered, *inter alia*, that Lucach and Zandian be denied all export privileges for a period of ten years. Having examined the record, including the submissions by the Respondent and by the Department, I hereby affirm the Decision and Order of the ALJ in all respects.

This Order constitutes the final Agency action in this matter.

Dated: July 24, 1995.

**William A. Reinsch,**

*Under Secretary for Export Administration.*

In the matter of: Lucach Corporation, 17526 Von Karmen, Irvine, California 92714, Respondent.

## Recommended Decision and Order

On December 6, 1993, the Office of Export Enforcement, Bureau of Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce (Department), issued a Charging Letter to Lucach Corporation (Lucach), addressed to the attention of Golamreza Zandianjazi, also known as Reza Zandian, President, alleging that Lucach violated § 787.5(a) and 787.6 of the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR Parts 768-799 (1995)) (the Regulations), issued pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C.A. app. §§ 2401-2410 (1991, Supp. 1993, and Public Law 103-277, July 5, 1994)) (the Act). On February 1, 1994, the Charging Letter was accepted by Amin Daghigh as agent for Reza Zandian.

On March 1, 1994, Lucach, through counsel, entered an appearance and requested an extension of time to answer the Charging Letter. In that submission, counsel also acknowledged service of the Charging Letter on Lucach. On April 7, 1994, an answer and demand for hearing were filed by counsel.

On April 17, 1995, I issued an Order setting this matter for hearing on May 23, 1995 and directing the parties to report to me on the progress of settlement discussions. On April 21, 1995 and on May 9, 1995, in accordance with my order of April 17, 1995, the parties filed joint submissions on settlement discussions. Also on May 9, 1995, shortly after authorizing counsel for the Department to execute the Joint Submission on Settlement Discussions on his behalf and to file the Submission with the Administrative Law Judge, counsel for Lucach filed a Motion to Withdraw Representation.<sup>1</sup> On May 10, 1995, I granted counsel's request to withdraw.

On May 17, 1995, following the withdrawal of counsel, the Department filed a petition to vacate the April 17, 1995 scheduling Order. On May 18, 1995, I issued an Order vacating the scheduling Order and providing the Department until June 16, 1995 "to indicate whether [it] intends to proceed with this case." On June 16, 1995, the Department advised me that it intended to proceed with the case and requested that I set a new scheduling order in the case. On June 19, 1995, I issued an Order stating that "[t]he appropriate way to resolve the proceeding under these circumstances is pursuant to

<sup>1</sup> In that Motion, counsel represented, *inter alia*, that Zandian told counsel that he (Zandian) "had sold his stock in Respondent [Lucach] in 1989 and had at no time thereafter been a director, officer or employee of Respondent."