3716, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

Dated: August 19, 1998.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–23236 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 40–98]

Foreign-Trade Zone 126—Reno/Sparks, Nevada Area Application for Expansion

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) by the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada, grantee of FTZ 126, requesting authority to expand its zone in the Reno/Sparks area, within the Reno Customs port of entry. The application was submitted pursuant to the provisions of the FTZ Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR Part 400). It was formally filed on August 17, 1998.

FTZ 126 was approved on April 4, 1986 (Board Order 328, 51 FR 12904, 4/16/86) and expanded on February 25, 1997 (Board Order 872, 62 FR 10520, 3/7/97). The general-purpose zone currently consists of three sites: *Site 1* (15 acres) located on Spice Island Drive near the Reno International Airport, Sparks; *Site 2* (9 acres, 482,000 sq. ft.) located at 450–475 Lillard Drive, Sparks; and, *Site 3* (30 acres) consists of a warehouse complex with four related, but noncontiguous sites in Reno.

The applicant, in a major revision to its zone plan, now requests authority to expand the general-purpose zone to include 4 new sites (17,183 acres) in the Reno/Sparks area: *Proposed Site 4* (4,646 acres)—Nevada Pacific Industrial Park, Nevada Pacific Parkway & East Newlands Drive, Fernley; *Proposed Site 5* (5,000 acres)—Asamera Ranch Industrial Center, Waltham Way Bridge and the Patrick Exit, Sparks; *Proposed Site 6* (2,176 acres)—Reno-Tahoe International Airport, Reno; and, *Proposed Site 7* (5,361 acres)—Reno-Stead Airport (a converted military base), 10 miles north of the Reno-Tahoe International Airport, Reno. Proposed Site 4 is owned by Wade/Fernley, L.P. and the Dermody Properties Operating Partnership and Proposed Site 5 is owned by Asamera Minerals (U.S.) Inc. Proposed Sites 6 and 7 are primarily publicly owned with some adjacent privately owned developments. Nevada Foreign Trade Services will be the FTZ operator of the sites. No specific manufacturing requests are being made 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 the address below. The closing period for their receipt is October 27, 1998. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to November 12, 1998).

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at each of the following locations:

U.S. Department of Commerce, Export Assistance Office, 1755 East Plumb Lane, Room 152, Reno, NV 89502

Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 3716, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: August 20, 1998.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–23237 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–427–811]

Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods From France: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 28, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Bolling or Stephen Jacques, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3434 or (202) 482–1391, respectively.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this administrative review are certain stainless steel wire rods (SSWR), products which are hot-rolled or hot-rolled annealed, and/or pickled rounds, squares, octagons, hexagons, or other shapes, in coils. SSWR are made of alloy steels containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with or without other elements. These products are only manufactured by hot-rolling, are normally sold in coiled form, and are of solid cross section. The majority of SSWR sold in the United States is round in cross-sectional shape, annealed, and pickled. The most common size is 5.5 millimeters in diameter.

The SSWR subject to this review is currently classifiable under subheadings 7221.00.0005, 7221.00.0015, 7221.00.0020, 7221.00.0030, 7221.00.0040, 7221.00.0045, 7221.00.0060, 7221.00.0075, and 7221.00.0080 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Amendment of Final Results

On June 3, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rods from France (63 FR 30185). This review covered Imphy S.A., and Ugine-Savoie, two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is January 1, 1996, through December 31, 1996.

On June 5, 1998, we received a submission from Imphy, S.A. and Ugine-Savoie, and their affiliated United States entities, Metalimphy Alloys Corp. and Techalloy Company (collectively ''respondents'') alleging clerical errors in the final results of this third administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rods from France. On June 8, 1998, counsel for the petitioning companies, Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Armco Stainless & Alloy Products, Carpenter Technology Corp., Republic Engineered Steels, Talley Metals Technology, Inc., United Steelworkers of America, and AFL-CIO/CLC (collectively ''petitioners'') filed allegations of clerical errors. Respondents submitted rebuttal comments on June 15, 1998. The allegations and rebuttal comments were filed in a timely fashion.

Comment 1: Respondents allege that the Department committed one ministerial error in the final results of administrative review. Respondents stated that the Department determined in its final results that it agreed with petitioners and corrected its preliminary results model match program, which had incorrectly excluded certain U.S. sales that entered the United States outside the POR. Respondents note that they did not disagree with petitioners' argument concerning the model match program. However, respondents argue that the Department's correction created a new error by excluding from the model match program certain sales that entered during the POR but were sold before the POR. Petitioners did not respond to respondents' claim.

Department's Position: After a review of respondents' allegations, we agree with respondents and have corrected our model match program to include the missing sales in the model match program. For the computer code we used to correct this ministerial error, please see the *Memorandum from Robert A. Bolling to Edward Yang* dated July 1, 1998 (''*Amended Final Calculation Memorandum*''), a public version of which is available in the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce building, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Comment 2: Petitioners allege that the Department made several ministerial errors. First, petitioners state that, in the final results, the Department attempted to correct calculation errors concerning home market credit expenses with missing shipment and payment dates. Petitioners argue that the Department's revised programming language failed to correct these errors in the recalculation of home market credit. Petitioners note that the Department's recalculation resulted in abnormally high credit expenses and negative net home market prices when home market sales did not have a payment date but did have a shipment date. Petitioners argue that the inclusion of home market sales with negative net prices understated normal value that was compared to U.S. prices and distorted the final margin analysis. Petitioners argue that the Department should revise its model match program to correct these errors. Petitioners propose that the Department rely on information reported by the respondents for its home market credit expenses to avoid further confusion related to recalculation of these home market credit expenses. Respondents stated that they do not object to the correction proposed by petitioners.

Second, petitioners state that the Department intended to recalculate U.S. credit expenses for sales with missing payment dates. Petitioners argue that the Department's computer program did not include language to recalculate these credit expenses for certain CEP and CEP/FM sales through Techalloy. Respondents state that they do not object to the correction proposed by petitioners.

Lastly, petitioners state that the Department calculated total selling expenses for respondents' CEP and CEP/FM sales (CEPSELL), and then applied the CEP profit ratio (CEPRATIO) to CEPSELL to obtain the amount of CEP profit that is deducted from a respondent's reported U.S. gross unit price. Petitioners argue that under the Department's normal practice, the variable CEPSELL should include all selling expenses, direct or indirect, incurred for CEP sales. Petitioners contend that the Department's final margin calculation program incorrectly removed the variable INDEXUS that contained respondents' reported indirect selling expenses incurred in the United States for their CEP and CEP/FM sales from the calculation of CEPSELL. Finally, petitioners argue that the removal of these indirect selling expenses from CEPSELL understated respondents' reported total selling expenses incurred for their U.S. CEP and CEP/FM sales which consequently understated the amount of CEP profit. Respondents state that they do not object to the correction proposed by petitioners.

Department's Position: With respect to home market credit expenses, we disagree with petitioners. In the preliminary results, we attempted to calculate home market credit expenses for sales with missing shipment and payment dates. Respondents commented that this calculation was erroneous because of two programming errors in the calculation. In the final results, we corrected these errors through programming language different from that suggested by respondents. Petitioners allege that these corrections are erroneous because they result in abnormally high credit expenses for some sales. Petitioners, however, have failed to point to any specific programming language which is in error, and the mere allegation that certain calculated expenses are too high is insufficient for finding a ministerial error. For a complete explanation, please see the *Amended Final Calculation Memorandum*.

With respect to U.S. credit expenses, we agree with petitioners and have corrected our margin calculation program to recalculate credit expenses for certain sales through Techalloy. For the computer code we used to correct this ministerial error, please see the *Amended Final Calculation Memorandum*.

With respect to indirect selling expenses, we agree with petitioners and have corrected our margin calculation program to include the variable INDEXUS in the calculation of CEPSELL for CEP and CEP/FM sales. For the computer code we used to correct this ministerial error, please see the *Amended Final Calculation Memorandum*.

Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of our review and the correction of the ministerial errors described above, we have determined that the following margins exist:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Imphy/Ugine-Savoie	1/1/96–12/31/96	7.10

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and normal value may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service. The amended final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by this review. For duty assessment purposes, we calculated an importer-specific assessment rate by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing this amount by the total value of subject merchandise entered during the POR for each importer.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective, upon publication of this notice of amended final results of review for all shipments of certain stainless steel wire rods from France entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates for those firms as stated above; (2) for previously investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 24.51 percent for stainless steel wire rods, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigations. *See Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods from France* (59 FR 4022, January 28, 1994).

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with section 353.34(d) of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: August 20, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–23235 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 082098J]

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council will convene public meetings of the Reef Fish Advisory Panel (AP) and the Standing and Special Reef Fish Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC).

DATES: The meeting of the Reef Fish AP will begin at 8:30 a.m. on Tuesday, September 8, 1998, and conclude by 4:00 p.m. The Standing and Special Reef Fish SSC will begin at 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, September 9, 1998, and conclude by 12:00 noon. A meeting of the Standing SSC will begin at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, September 9, 1998, and conclude by 12:00 noon on Thursday, September 10, 1998.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Crowne Plaza New Orleans, 333 Poydras Street, New Orleans, LA 70130; telephone: 504–525–9444.

Council address: Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 3018 U.S. Highway 301 North, Suite 1000, Tampa, Florida, 33619.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Atran, Population Dynamics Statistician, Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; telephone: 813–228–2815.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The AP, consisting of recreational and commercial fishermen, will review stock assessments of gag and vermilion snapper that were prepared by the NMFS and reports from the Council's Reef Fish Stock Assessment Panel and Socioeconomic Panel that include biological, social, and economic information related to the range of acceptable biological catch (ABC). Based on these reports, the AP may recommend levels of total allowable catch (TAC) for these species and appropriate management measures.

The Standing and Special Reef Fish SSC, consisting of economists, biologists, sociologists, and natural resource attorneys, will also review the above reports, comment on their scientific adequacy, and may make recommendations regarding TAC and management measures. In addition, the Standing SSC will review a report of an Ad Hoc Finfish Stock Assessment Panel on additional alternatives for potential proxies for maximum sustainable yield (MSY) for at least red snapper, king mackerel, and red drum. The Standing SSC will also consider the feasibility of using the ratio of natural mortality rate to growth rate (the M/K ratio) as a basis for setting the appropriate level of spawning potential ratio (SPR) that should be used as a proxy for MSY. Generation times for jewfish and Nassau grouper may also be considered. In addition, the Standing SSC will review a presentation from NMFS on the effectiveness of shrimp trawl bycatch reduction devices (BRDs) with respect to reducing juvenile red snapper bycatch mortality. The results of the NMFS BRD study will be a major factor in the decision by NMFS on whether to release additional red snapper TAC in 1998.

Although other issues not on the agenda may come before the panels for discussion, in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, those issues may not be the subject of formal action during this meeting. Actions will be restricted to those issues specifically identified in the agenda listed as available by this notice.

Special Accommodations

These meetings are physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Anne Alford at the Council (see **ADDRESSES**) by September 1, 1998.

Dated: August 21, 1998.

Gary C. Matlock,

Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 98–23184 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 082098E]

North Pacific Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The North Pacific Fishery Management Council's (Council) Gulf of Alaska (GOA) and Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands (BSAI) Groundfish Plan Teams will meet in Seattle, WA.

DATES: The meetings will be held September 15–18, 1998, beginning at 8:00 a.m. on Tuesday, September 15.

ADDRESSES: The meetings will be held in Room 2079, Building 4, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, WA.

Council address: North Pacific Fishery Management Council, 605 W. 4th Ave., Suite 306, Anchorage, AK 99501–2252.