Thursday, February 5, 1998, at the Westborough State Hospital, Lincoln Room, P.O. Box 288, Lyman Street, Westborough, Massachusetts 01581. The purpose of the meeting is to plan for the statewide civil rights conference scheduled for March 1998.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Committee Chairperson Fletcher Blanchard, 413–585–3909, or Ki-Taek Chun, Director of the Eastern Regional Office, 202–376–7533 (TDD 202–376–8116). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least ten (10) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, January 8, 1998.

Carol-Lee Hurley,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 98–1065 Filed 1–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–351–820]

Ferrosilicon From Brazil: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On November 22, 1996, the Department of Commerce published the final results of the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on ferrosilicon from Brazil. The review covered Companhia de Ferro Ligas da Bahia, a manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review is August 15, 1993 through February 28, 1995. The respondent and the petitioners filed ministerial error comments with regard to these final results of review on November 25, and November 26, 1996, respectively. Subsequently, both parties filed suit with the Court of International Trade regarding these final results of review. On August 18, 1997, the Court on International Trade consolidated the court cases and gave leave to the Department of Commerce to consider certain alleged ministerial errors, and where appropriate, make corrections. Based on the correction of certain ministerial errors made in the final results of review, we are amending our final results of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 15, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cameron Werker or Wendy J. Frankel, AD/CVD Enforcement Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–3874 or (202) 482–5849, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

The Department of Commerce (the Department) has now amended the final results of this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations as codified at 19 CFR 353 (April 1, 1997).

Background

On November 22, 1996, the Department published the final results of the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on ferrosilicon from Brazil (61 FR 59407), covering the period August 15, 1993 through February 28, 1995. The respondent is Companhia de Ferro Ligas da Bahia (Ferbasa). The petitioners are Aimcor and SKW Metals & Alloys Inc.

On November 25, and November 26, 1996, respectively, Ferbasa and the petitioners filed allegations that the Department made certain ministerial errors in the final results of administrative review. Subsequently, both parties filed suit with the Court of International Trade (CIT) regarding the final results of review. On August 18, 1997, the CIT consolidated the court cases and gave leave to the Department to consider certain alleged ministerial errors, and where appropriate, make corrections.

As discussed below, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(d), we have determined that the issues raised in the order from the CIT are ministerial errors. On December 17, 1997, the Department released draft amended final results of review to Ferbasa and to petitioners. On January 7, 1998, Ferbasa submitted comments regarding the draft final results of review. The petitioners did not submit comments.

Alleged Ministerial Errors

Issue 1: Ferbasa argues that the Department erroneously added to constructed value (CV) an amount calculated for ICMS and IPI taxes related to home market sales prices rather than materials costs.

Department's Position: We agree with Ferbasa. In our calculation of CV for the final results of review, we inadvertently used the tax amounts reported for home market sales. For these amended final results we have used the amounts provided by Ferbasa in Exhibit D–16 of its March 27, 1996, supplemental submission, which reflect the amount of ICMS and IPI taxes incurred for material inputs used in the production of ferrosilicon.

Issue 2: Ferbasa asserts that in calculating it's home market indirect selling expenses, the Department erroneously used the originally reported indirect selling expense figures rather than the corrected values reported in Exhibit D–20 of it's March 27, 1996, supplemental submission.

Department's Position: We agree with Ferbasa that we inadvertently used the incorrect indirect selling expenses provided in Ferbasa's original submission. For these amended final results, we have used the corrected values reported by Ferbasa in Exhibit D–20 of its March 27, 1996, supplemental submission.

Issue 3: The petitioners argue that for the final results of review, the Department failed to express the final dumping margin as a percentage in the computer calculations, thereby understating the margin by a factor of 100.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioner. For these amended final results, we have formatted the calculation spreadsheet to express the margin as a percentage.

Issue 4: The petitioners state that in calculating CV, the Department used only the cost of production (COP) values for December 1994, and therefore, normal value, which was based on CV, was not based on a six-month weighted average CV as discussed in the Department's final results of review **Federal Register** notice.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioners that in our calculation of normal value, we inadvertently failed to weight average the six months of costs for the subject merchandise. We corrected this error for the amended final results of review.

Issue 5: The petitioners allege that when converting normal value from

reais to U.S. dollars, the Department incorrectly divided the reais amount by the exchange rate.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioners. The exchange rate that the Department used was 1.182033 U.S. dollars = 1 real. Therefore, when converting reais to U.S. dollars, we should have multiplied the reais amount by 1.182033. We have corrected this calculation for these amended final results of review.

Issue 6: The petitioners allege that the Department made the same conversion error, noted in *Issue 5* above, with regard to U.S. packing expenses.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioners and have corrected this error for these amended final results of review.

Issue 7: The petitioners contend that in calculating adjustments to CV the Department subtracted home market packing expenses from a CV that did not include those expenses.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioners, and have eliminated this adjustment from the weighted-average margin calculation for these amended final results of review.

Issue 8: The petitioners note that although the Department's final results of review analysis memorandum states that the Department calculated the ratio of net profit to cost of goods sold based on information from Ferbasa's financial statements, it appears that the Department actually calculated a ratio of net profit to net sales value, thereby understating the profit ratio.

Ferbasa contends that in the draft amended final results of review, the Department calculated the profit ratio using profit and cost of manufacturing rather than profit and cost of goods sold. Ferbasa further contends that the Department should apply the profit rate to a pre-profit CV that does not include amounts for ICMS and IPI taxes since the profit ratio is calculated based on a cost of goods sold amount that is net of the ICMS and IPI taxes.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioners that in our final results of review we inadvertently calculated a ratio of profit to net sales value. We also agree with Ferbasa that for the draft amended final results of review, we inadvertently used the cost of manufacturing rather than the cost of goods sold in our profit rate calculation. For these amended final results, we have corrected the profit calculation to reflect a ratio of net profit to cost of goods sold. However, there is no information on the record to substantiate Ferbasa's claim that the cost of goods sold figure is calculated net of ICMS and IPI taxes. Therefore, we are not changing the pre-profit CV in our calculations to exclude these taxes.

Issue 9: The petitioners argue that the Department's final results of review analysis memorandum states that the Department applied an 18 percent facts available (FA) rate for ICMS taxes incurred by Ferbasa on electricity costs. Petitioners note, however, that in the calculations, the Department applied as FA for ICMS taxes on electricity an actual figure that was less than 18 percent of Ferbasa's electricity cost.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioners and have corrected this error for these amended final results of review.

Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of our correction of the ministerial errors, we have determined that the amended weighted-average margin for Ferbasa for the period August 15, 1993 through February 28, 1995 is 30.69 percent.

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appraisement instructions concerning the respondent directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following cash deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final amended results of administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The amended cash deposit rate for the reviewed company named above will be the rate as stated above; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed 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 less than fair value (LTFV) 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) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review, the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will be 35.95 percent, the All Others rate established in the amended final LTFV investigation. These amended deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Assessment Rates

For assessment purposes, we calculated an importer-specific assessment rate. For the export price (EP) sale, we divided the total dumping margin (calculated as the difference between normal value and EP) by the total entered value of the merchandise. Upon completion of this review, we will direct the U.S. Customs Service to assess the resulting *ad valorem* rate against the entered value of each entry of the subject merchandise by the importer during the period of review.

This notice also serves as the 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 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written 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 the APO is a sanctionable violation.

These amended final results of administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) and (h) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1) and (h) and 19 CFR 353.28.

Dated: January 12, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–1158 Filed 1–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 010998B]

Western 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 Western Pacific Fishery Council will hold public meetings (including hearings) in Hawaii on the islands of Maui, Oahu, and Kauai to