Dated: April 28, 1998.

**Christopher E. Goldthwait,**

*Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service.*

[FR Doc. 98–11698 Filed 5–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–10–M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Foreign Agricultural Service

### Notice of Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee for Trade and Agricultural Technical Advisory Committees for Trade Meetings

**AGENCY:** Foreign Agricultural Service.

**ACTION:** Notice of meetings.

**SUMMARY:** The Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee for Trade (APAC) and the Agricultural Technical Advisory Committees for Trade (ATACs) will hold meetings during the period of May 1, 1998–December 20, 1998. The meetings will include a review and discussion of current issues which influence U.S. agricultural trade policy that include, but are not limited to, issues concerning GATT accession negotiations with various countries; U.S./Mexico bilateral agricultural trade issues; U.S./Canada bilateral agricultural trade issues; international sanitary and phytosanitary barriers to trade; and WTO Uruguay Round Agreement implementation issues.

Pursuant to section 2155(f)(2) of title 19 of the United States Code, the U.S. Trade Representative has determined that these meetings will be concerned solely with matters the disclosure of which would seriously compromise the development by the United States Government of trade policy priorities, negotiating objectives, bargaining positions. Accordingly, these meetings will be closed to the public.

**ADDRESSES:** The meetings will be held at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 14th and Independence Avenues, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250 unless an alternate site is necessary.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Pate Felts, Director of Intergovernmental Affairs, Office of the United States Trade Representative at (202) 395–6120 or Paula Thomasson, Joint Executive Secretary, Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee for Trade, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at (202) 720–6829.

Dated: April 28, 1998.

**Lon Hatamiya,**

*Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service.*

[FR Doc. 98–11789 Filed 5–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–10–M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

### Designation for the Champaign (IL), Eastern Iowa (IA), and Enid (OK) Areas

**AGENCY:** Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** GIPSA announces the designation of Champaign-Danville Grain Inspection Departments, Inc. (Champaign), Eastern-Iowa Grain Inspection and Weighing Service, Inc. (Eastern Iowa), and Enid Grain Inspection Company, Inc. (Enid), to provide official services under the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended (Act).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 1, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** USDA, GIPSA, Janet M. Hart, Chief, Review Branch, Compliance Division, STOP 3604, Room 1647–S, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20250–3604.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Janet M. Hart, at 202–720–8525.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This action has been reviewed and determined not to be a rule or regulation as defined in Executive Order 12866 and Departmental Regulation 1512–1; therefore, the Executive Order and Departmental Regulation do not apply to this action.

In the December 1, 1997, **Federal Register** (62 FR 63513), GIPSA asked persons interested in providing official services in the geographic areas assigned to Champaign and Enid to submit an application for designation. Applications were due by December 30 1997. Champaign and Enid, the only applicants, each applied for designation to provide official services in the entire area currently assigned to them.

In the December 17, 1997, **Federal Register** (62 FR 66051), GIPSA asked persons interested in providing official services in the geographic area assigned to Eastern Iowa to submit an application for designation. Applications were due by January 15 1998. Eastern Iowa, the only applicant, applied for designation to provide official services in the entire area currently assigned to them.

Since Champaign, Eastern Iowa, and Enid were the only applicants, GIPSA did not ask for comments on them.

GIPSA evaluated all available information regarding the designation criteria in Section 7(f)(l)(A) of the Act and, according to Section 7(f)(l)(B), determined that Champaign, Eastern Iowa, and Enid are able to provide official services in the geographic areas for which they applied. Effective June 1, 1998, and ending May 31, 2001, Champaign is designated to provide official services in the geographic area specified in the December 1, 1997, **Federal Register**. Effective August 1, 1998, and ending May 31, 2001, Eastern Iowa is designated to provide official services in the geographic area specified in the December 17, 1997, **Federal Register**. Effective July 1, 1998, and ending May 31, 2001, Enid is designated to provide official services in the geographic area specified in the December 1, 1997, **Federal Register**.

Interested persons may obtain official services by contacting Champaign at 217–398–0723, Eastern Iowa at 319–322–7149, and Enid at 405–233–1121.

**Authority:** Pub. L. 94–582, 90 Stat. 2867, as amended (7 U.S.C. 71 *et seq.*).

Dated: April 27, 1998.

**Neil E. Porter,**

*Director, Compliance Division.*

[FR Doc. 98–11694 Filed 5–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–EN–P

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Natural Resource Conservation Service

### Notice of Proposed Change to the Natural Resources Conservation Service's National Handbook of Conservation Practices

**AGENCY:** Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), U.S. Department of Agriculture, New York State Office.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of proposed changes in the NRCS National Handbook of Conservation Practices, Section IV of the New York State NRCS Field Office Technical Guide (FOTG) for review and comment.

**SUMMARY:** It is the intention of NRCS to issue a series of new conservation practice standards in its National Handbook of Conservation Practices. These new standards include; Agrichemical Mixing Facility (NY702) and Record Keeping (NY748).

**DATES:** Comments will be received on or before June 3, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Inquire in writing to Richard D. Swenson, State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), 441 S. Salina Street, Fifth Floor, Suite 354, Syracuse, New York, 13202–2450. Copies of these standards are available by request from the above individual.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 343 of the Federal Agricultural

Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 states that revisions made after the enactment of the law to NRCS State Technical Guides used to carry out highly erodible land and wetland provisions of the law shall be made available for public review and comment. For the next 30 days the NRCS will receive comments relative to the proposed changes. Following that period a determination will be made by the NRCS regarding disposition of those comments and a final determination of change will be made.

Dated: April 24, 1998.

**Steven L. Machovec,**

*Acting State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Syracuse, NY.*

[FR Doc. 98–11593 Filed 5–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–16–M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A–201–802]**

### Gray Portland Cement and Clinker From Mexico: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 4, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Nithya Nagarajan, Kristen Stevens, or John Totaro, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue N.W, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3793.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (hereinafter, ''the Act'') by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA''). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the old regulations (19 CFR part 353 (1997)).

### Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review include gray portland cement and clinker. Gray portland cement is a hydraulic cement and the primary component of concrete. Clinker, an intermediate material product produced when manufacturing cement, has no use other than being ground into finished cement. Gray portland cement is currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item number 2523.29 and cement clinker is currently classifiable under HTS item number 2523.10. Gray portland cement has also been entered under HTS item number 2523.90 as ''other hydraulic cements.'' The HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and U.S. Customs Service purposes only. Our written description of the scope of the order remains dispositive.

### Amendment of Final Results

On March 16, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Gray Portland Cement and Clinker from Mexico (63 FR 12764 ). This review covered CEMEX S.A de C.V (CEMEX), and its affiliate, Cementos de Chihuahua (CDC), manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is August 1, 1995 through July 31, 1996.

On March 24, 1998, counsel for petitioner, the Southern Tier Cement Producers Committee, filed allegations of clerical errors with regard to the final results in the sixth administrative review of the antidumping duty order of gray portland cement and clinker from Mexico. On April 3, 1997, counsel for the respondent, CEMEX, also filed allegations of clerical errors with regard to this review. Petitioner then filed rebuttal comments on April 10, 1998. The Department, upon review of the allegations, agrees that certain aspects of the final results constitute ministerial errors within the meaning of 19 CFR 353.28, and is hereby issuing an amended final based on corrections for these ministerial errors.

First, CEMEX and petitioner noted that the margin program contained an incorrect instruction which resulted in an incorrect calculation of home market credit and inventory carrying cost. The Department, upon review of the margin program determined that the original final margin program failed to perform the proper mathematical calculation in calculating home market credit and inventory carrying cost, and U.S. credit and inventory carrying cost. The Department has corrected the amended final margin program to reflect these changes. For a complete discussion of the Department's corrected margin program, please see the amended final results analysis memo from the case analyst to the file.

Second, CEMEX contends that the Department used an incorrect factor to convert quantities from short tons to metric tons in the margin calculation program. CEMEX did not raise this alleged error in its case brief for the sixth review. The petitioner argues that the Department used this conversion factor in the fifth review amended final results, the sixth review preliminary results, and the sixth review final results. We agree with petitioner, moreover, CEMEX did not object to the explicit statement in the **Federal Register** notice of the fifth review amended final results that the Department used the conversion factor CEMEX now contests—.907194 metric tons per short ton—in the amended final results. The Department's short ton/metric ton conversion factor (1 MT=1.1023 ST; 1/1.1023=0.907194) varies by 0.000009 from the factor proposed by CEMEX as the ''numerically correct'' factor (1 ST=2000 Lbs.; 1 MT=2,204.623 Lbs.; 2000/2,204.623=*0.907185).* Clearly, the Department's conversion factor is also ''numerically correct,'' but reflects a different calculation methodology from that proposed by CEMEX. Thus, the Department did not err by using this factor, and we will not depart from established practice by adopting CEMEX's conversion factor for the sixth review amended final results.

Third, CEMEX alleges that the Department used incorrect inflation factors for the months of December 1995 and January 1996 in its calculation of the difference in merchandise (DIFMER) adjustment. Petitioner did not object to the corrected inflation factor, but noted that the Department failed to use the appropriate costs, as revised after verification, in the DIFMER adjustment calculation. Upon review of the margin program, the Department determined that CEMEX and petitioner are both correct, therefore, we have revised the inflation factors for the months of December 1995 and January 1996, revised the cost of production to reflect the costs as reported to us after verification, and recalculated DIFMER for both CEMEX and its collapsed affiliate, CDC. For a complete discussion of the Department's corrected margin program, please see the amended final results analysis memo from the case analyst to the file.

Finally, petitioner alleges that the Department failed to issue a final duty absorption finding in the **Federal Register** notice for the final results of review. CEMEX did not rebut petitioner's allegation. Upon review of the final results, the Department has determined that its position has not altered from the preliminary results of review and has determined that the