

antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from Mexico. The review covered the period December 1, 1989 through November 30, 1990.

Subsequent to the final results, Cinsa, one of two respondents, challenged the Department's determination before the Court on four issues. The Court issued a remand with respect to one issue only and directed the Department to determine whether the transfer price for enamel frit provided to the Department in that review constituted an arm's-length transaction as prescribed by the statute and previous practice. The Court agreed with the Department that the burden was on the respondent to "establish that the transfer price for the purchase of raw material from the related party reflects an arm's-length price." However, it found that Cinsa had met its initial burden by supplying the Department with the requested explanation of how it determined the transfer price to be representative of a fair market price and of how it determined that transfer prices were above the cost of production. The Court found that Cinsa had effectively shifted the burden to the Department by explaining the discount in the transfer price, which was all the Department had requested of Cinsa during that review.

The Department filed its redetermination on July 2, 1997. Although the Department respectfully disagreed with the Court's conclusion that Cinsa fulfilled its burden of proving the arm's-length nature of the related party transfer price, the Department determined that, for purposes of the remand, it should use Cinsa's reported transfer price for enamel frit from its related supplier to calculate constructed value because, in that review, the Department did not request that Cinsa provide any documentation in support of its claim that the extent of differences between the transfer prices for frit and the prices at which frit was sold to unrelated firms were accounted for fully. On September 16, 1997, the Court vacated the final results rate for respondent Cinsa and affirmed the Department's redetermination. No party contested that Court decision.

Results of Remand

In accordance with the results of remand affirmed by the Court, we are amending the final results of review. The margin for Cinsa is reduced from 6.71 percent to 6.04 percent.

The Department will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between U.S. price and foreign market value may vary from the percentage stated above. The

Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service. The above rate will not affect Cinsa's cash deposit requirements currently in effect, which will continue to be based on the margin found to exist in the most recently completed review.

This amendment to the final results of antidumping duty administrative review notice is in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and § 353.22 of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.22 (1989)).

Dated: September 30, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-26780 Filed 10-5-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

[A-834-802, A-835-802, A-844-802]

Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium From Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan.

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

ACTION: Notice of price determination on Uranium from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section IV.C.1. of the agreements suspending the antidumping investigation on uranium from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan, as amended, (antidumping suspension agreement on uranium from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan), the Department of Commerce (the Department) calculated a price for uranium of \$10.85/pound of U₃O₈ for the relevant period, as appropriate. Under Section IV.A, exports from Kazakhstan to the United States are subject to quotas determined based on price levels as outlined in Appendix A. On the basis of this price and Appendix A of the suspension agreement with Kazakhstan, there is no quota for uranium from Kazakhstan for the period October 1, 1998, through March 30, 1999. This price will also be used, as appropriate, according to Section IV.A. of the Uzbek agreement. The quota for the current relevant period for Uzbekistan, October 13, 1998–October 12, 1999, has been announced in the *Notice of Price Determination on Uranium from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and*

Uzbekistan, separately, due to the fact that this quota is now based on a production-tied quota, in accordance with Section IV.A. of that agreement.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Letitia Kress, Office of Antidumping Countervailing Duty Enforcement—Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-6412.

Price Calculation

Background

Section IV.C.1. of the antidumping suspension agreements on uranium from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan specifies that the Department will issue its determined market price on October 1, 1998, and use it to determine the quota applicable to imports from Kazakhstan during the period October 1, 1998, to March 30, 1999, and Uzbekistan during the period of October 13, 1998 to October 12, 1999. Consistent with the February 22, 1993 letter of interpretation, the Department provided interested parties with the preliminary price determination on September 21, 1998.

Calculation Summary

Section IV.C.1. of these agreements specifies how the components of the market price are reached. In order to determine the spot market price, the Department utilized the monthly average of the Uranium Price Information System Spot Price Indicator (UPIS SPI) and the weekly average of the Uranium Exchange Spot Price (Ux Spot). In order to determine the long-term market price, the Department utilized the weighted-average long-term price as determined by the Department on the basis of information provided by market participants and a simple average of the UPIS U.S. Base Price for the months in which there were new contracts reported.

The Department's letters to market participants provided a contract summary sheet and directions requesting the submitter to report his/her best estimate of the future price of merchandise to be delivered in accordance with the contract delivery schedules (in U.S. dollars per pound U₃O₈ equivalent). Using the information reported in the proprietary summary sheets, the Department calculated the present value of the prices reported for any future deliveries assuming an annual inflation rate of 1.51 percent, which was derived from a rolling

average of the annual Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator index from the past four years. The Department then calculated weight-averaged annual prices according to the specified nominal delivery volumes for each year to arrive at the long-term contract price. The Department then calculated a simple average of the UPIS U.S. Base Price and the long-term contract price as determined by the Department.

Weighting

The Department used the average spot and long-term volumes of U.S. utility and domestic supplier purchases, as reported by the Energy Information Administration (EIA), to weight the spot and long-term components of the observed price. In this instance, we have used purchase data from the period 1994–1997. During this period, the spot market accounted for 77.66 percent of total purchases, and the long-term market for 22.34 percent.

As in previous determinations, the Department used the Energy Information Administration's (EIA) *Uranium Industry Annual* to determine the available average spot- and long-term volumes of U.S. utility purchases. We have updated the data to reflect the period 1994 through 1997. The EIA has withheld certain business proprietary contract data from the public versions of the *Uranium Industry Annual 1994*, *Uranium Industry Annual 1995*, *Uranium Industry Annual 1996* and the *Uranium Industry Annual 1997*. The EIA, however, provided all business proprietary data to the Department and the Department has used it to update its weighting calculation.

Calculation Announcement

The Department determined, using the methodology and information described above, that the observed market price is \$10.85. This reflects an average spot market price of \$10.71, weighted at 77.66 percent, and an average long-term contract price of \$11.30, weighted at 22.34 percent. Since this price is below \$12.00–\$13.99 as defined in Appendix A of the suspension agreement with Kazakhstan, Kazakhstan does not receive an Appendix A quota for the period October 1, 1998, to March 30, 1999. This price will also be used, as appropriate, according to Section IV.A. of the Uzbek agreement.

Comments

Consistent with the February 22, 1993, letter of interpretation, the Department provided interested parties the preliminary price determination for

this period on September 21, 1998. No interested party submitted comments.

Dated: September 29, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, for Antidumping Countervailing Duty—Group III.

[FR Doc. 98–26777 Filed 10–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee; Closed Meeting

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Closed meeting of U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee (the "Committee") advises U.S. Government officials on matters relating to the implementation of the Fair Trade in Auto Parts Act of 1988. The Committee: (1) Reports annually to the Secretary of Commerce on barriers to sales of U.S.-made auto parts and accessories in Japanese markets; (2) assists the Secretary in reporting to the Congress on the progress of sales of U.S.-made auto parts in Japanese markets, including the formation of long-term supplier relationships; (3) reviews and considers data collected on sales of U.S.-made auto parts to Japanese markets; (4) advises the Secretary during consultations with the Government of Japan on these issues; and (5) assists in establishing priorities for the Department's initiatives to increase U.S.-made auto parts sales to Japanese markets, and otherwise provide assistance and direction to the Secretary in carrying out these initiatives. At the meeting, committee members will discuss specific trade and sales expansion programs related to U.S.-Japan automotive parts policy.

DATE AND LOCATION: The meeting will be held on October 15, 1998 from 10:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the U.S. Department of Commerce in Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Robert Reck, Office of Automotive Affairs, Trade Development, Room 4036, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–1418.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Assistant Secretary for Administration, with the concurrence of the General Counsel formally determined on September 11, 1998, pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Act, as amended, that the series of meetings or portions of meetings of the Committee

and of any subcommittee thereof, dealing with privileged or confidential commercial information may be exempt from the provisions of the Act relating to open meeting and public participation therein because these items are concerned with matters that are within the purview of 5 U.S.C. 552b (c)(4) and (9)(B). A copy of the Notice of Determination is available for public inspection and copying in the Department of Commerce Records Inspection Facility, Room 6020, Main Commerce.

Dated: September 28, 1998.

Henry P. Misisco,

Director, Office of Automotive Affairs.

[FR Doc. 98–26740 Filed 10–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Textiles Trade Mission to Turkey; Correction

October 1, 1998.

In the **Federal Register** document published on September 30, 1998; on page 52243, column 3, delete "October 14, 1998" and insert the date of the event December 7–11, 1998 and closing date October 14, 1998.

Tom Nisbet,

Director, Office of Trade Promotion Coordination.

[FR Doc. 98–26729 Filed 10–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Notice of Availability for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Disposal and Reuse of Fort Chaffee, Arkansas

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the President's Council on Environmental Quality, the Army has prepared a DEIS for the disposal and reuse of Fort Chaffee, Arkansas. The approved 1995 base closure and realignment actions required by the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101–510), and subsequent actions in compliance with this law, mandated the closure of Fort Chaffee. It is Department of Defense (DOD) policy to dispose of property no longer needed by DOD.