f. Requirements for personal protection involved in transportation of cargoes containing toxic substances in oil tankers.

g. Review of existing ships' safety standards: amendment to SOLAS regulations VII/9 and VII/12.

h. Review of specifications for crude oil washing systems.

i. Revision of chapter 8 of the IBC Code in the light of the revised SOLAS regulation II–2/59.

j. Evaluation of safety and pollution hazards of chemicals and preparation of consequential amendments.

In addition, a supplemental meeting, to discuss the possible revision of the environmental hazard evaluation and categorization mechanism of the IBC Code, will be held at 9:30 AM on Monday, June 15, 1998 in Room 1103, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20593–0001. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the ramifications of going from a five pollution category system to a three pollution category system and, specifically, to determine how this change might affect the chemical shipping industry.

Members of the public may attend both meetings up to the seating capacity of the rooms. Interested persons may seek information by writing: Commander K.S. Cook, U.S. Coast Guard (G–MSO–3), 2100 Second Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20593–0001 or by calling (202) 267–1577.

Dated: May 14, 1998.

**Stephen M. Miller,**

*Executive Secretary, Shipping Coordinating Committee.*

[FR Doc. 98–13840 Filed 5–22–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–07–M

## TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** Tennessee Valley Authority (Meeting No. 1504).

**TIME AND DATE:** 9 a.m. (CDT), May 27, 1998.

**PLACE:** TVA Allen Fossil Plant Assembly Room, 2574 Plant Road, Memphis, Tennessee.

**STATUS:** Open.

### Agenda

Approval of minutes of meeting held on April 8, 1998.

### New Business

*C—Energy*

C1. Delegation of authority to the Senior Vice President, Procurement, or a designated representative, to enter into a uranium procurement contract with Global Nuclear Services and Supply Limited.

*B—Purchase Award*

B1. Supplement to Contract No. 97BYC–142392–001 with BTG, Inc., for personal computers, software, and related accessories.

*E—Real Property Transactions*

E1. Grant of a permanent easement to the City of Tupelo, Mississippi, affecting 1.49 acres in Lee County, Mississippi (Tract No. XTPCSC–7H), for the relocation of Brooks Road to accommodate the location of TVA's new Customer Service Center.

E2. Rescission of March 31, 1993, resolution directing payment of $398,217 annually to the City of Knoxville as mitigation payments associated with the purchase of the Knoxville TVA Office complex.

E3. Deed modification of certain deed provisions affecting approximately 0.22 acre of former TVA land on Watts Bar Lake (Tract No. XWBR–142) in Rhea County, Tennessee.

E4. Grant of a permanent easement to the City of Decatur, Alabama, for a waterline easement affecting 1.52 acres of land on Wheeler Lake in Morgan County, Alabama (Tract No. XTWR–107U).

E5. Sale of noncommercial, nonexclusive permanent easements to Hubert Helton and Steve Watson for construction and maintenance of recreational water-use facilities affecting a total of 0.29 acre of Tellico Lake shoreline in Monroe County, Tennessee (Tract Nos. XTELR–201RE and XTELR–202RE).

E6. Abandonment of certain easement rights affecting 0.7 acre of former TVA land on Norris Lake in Claiborne County, Tennessee (Tract No. XNR–468), to allow the property owner to construct a bridge and road to provide access to another section of currently inaccessible property.

### Information Items

1. Approval of two 19-year commercial recreation leases at Possum Creek and Sale Creek recreation areas and amendments to the Chickamauga Reservoir Land Management Plan.

2. Approval of a 19-year commercial recreation lease and amendment to the reservoir plan for Agency Creek Recreation Area in Meigs County, Tennessee, and amendment to the Chickamauga Reservoir Land Management Plan.

3. Approval of a grant of easement to Greeneville Light and Power System affecting approximately 0.75 acre of TVA land on Nolichucky Lake in Greene County, Tennessee (Tract No. XTNOR–5SS).

4. Approval of a 19-year commercial recreation lease to Greenlee Campground, R.V. & Marine at Fall Creek Recreation Area on Cherokee Lake in Hamblen County, Tennessee.

5. Approval to file condemnation cases: The affected transmission lines are Oneida-McCreary, McCreary County, Kentucky; Tiptonville Switching Station, Tiptonville, Tennessee; Colbert-Tupelo primary tap to Belmont, Belmont, Mississippi; New Albany-Holly Springs tap to Martintown, Union County, Mississippi; Pickwick Dam-Memphis tap to Moscow, Fayette County, Tennessee; New Albany-Holly Springs tap to Martintown; and an access road to TVA's Martintown, Tennessee, substation site, Union County, Mississippi.

6. Approval to file condemnation cases. The affected transmission lines are Freeport-Miller tap to Mitchell's Corner, DeSoto County, Mississippi and Wolf Creek-Summer Shade tap to West Tompkinsville, Monroe County, Kentucky.

7. Approval of the sale of an easement for municipal governmental purposes to the City of Tupelo, Mississippi, affecting 3.07 acres of TVA's Tupelo Line Crew Headquarters property in Tupelo, Mississippi (Tract No. XTLCH–1E).

For more information: Please call TVA Public Relations at (423) 632–6000, Knoxville, Tennessee. Information is also available at TVA's Washington Office (202) 898–2999.

Dated: May 20, 1998.

**Edward S. Christenbury,**

*General Counsel and Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98–13951 Filed 5–21–98; 11:36 am]

BILLING CODE 8120–08–M

## OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

### Trade Policy Staff Committee: Request for Comments Concerning Review of the World Trade Organization Dispute Settlement Understanding

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) is soliciting public comments on the United States position in the upcoming review of the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (Dispute Settlement Understanding, or DSU) under the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement. The

DSU provides the rules for settlement of disputes concerning rights and obligations under the Uruguay Round agreements administered by the WTO. Interested persons are invited to submit their comments by June 25, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Amelia Porges, Senior Counsel for Dispute Settlement, Office of the USTR, (202) 395–7305, or William Kane, Associate General Counsel, Office of the USTR, (202) 395–6800.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The DSU provides a mechanism for the settlement of disputes between the governments which are members of the WTO, concerning rights and obligations under the Uruguay Round agreements. A panel of neutral experts conducts each dispute settlement proceeding and issues a report, which is considered by the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) in which representatives of all WTO members participate. The DSB must adopt all panel reports within 60 days after they are circulated, unless one of the parties to the dispute notifies the DSB that it will appeal the decision (or the DSB decides by consensus to reject the report). Appeals are heard by the WTO Appellate Body (AB), which also issues a report. The DSB must adopt an appellate body report within 30 days after circulation (unless there is a consensus not to do so).

When it finds a measure is inconsistent with one of the covered agreements, a panel or the AB must recommend that the government concerned bring that measure into conformity with the agreement. At a DSB meeting held within 30 days after the panel or AB report is adopted, that government must state its compliance plans. The ''reasonable period'' for compliance can be determined by obtaining DSB approval of a time period proposed by that government, or by agreement between the disputing parties, or by binding arbitration. If a government does not comply with the recommendation to bring a measure into conformity with its WTO obligations, it must negotiate with the complaining government(s) on compensation, and the negotiations must start by the end of the ''reasonable period''. If there is no agreement on compensation by 20 days after the end of the ''reasonable period'', a complaining government may ask the DSB to authorize it to suspend trade benefits with respect to the non-complying party. By 30 days after the end of the ''reasonable period'', the DSB must grant such a request to suspend benefits (unless there is consensus otherwise). Such a suspension must be equivalent to the benefits the defending country is impairing by its WTO-inconsistent actions.

A Decision of trade ministers agreed on April 15, 1994, at the conclusion of the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations, invites the WTO Ministerial Conference to complete a ''full review'' of WTO dispute settlement rules and procedures within four years after the entry into force of the WTO Agreement and ''to take a decision on the occasion of its first meeting after the completion of the review, whether to continue, modify or terminate'' those rules and procedures. Under the WTO Agreement, this work may be carried out by the WTO's General Council. Discussions have begun on the organization of the review. A principal objective of the United States in the WTO, including in this review, is to enhance the openness and transparency of WTO meetings, decisions and dispute settlement proceedings.

Detailed information on the WTO and dispute settlement is available on the Internet at http://www.ustr.gov/reports/tpa/1998/iv.pdf; the text of the DSU is available on the Internet at http:www.wto.org/wto/dispute/dsu.htm.

Interested persons are invited to submit their comments on whether the WTO should continue, modify or terminate the DSU; on specific modifications which should be made to WTO dispute settlement rules and procedures; and on specific policies which the United States should pursue in this review. Comments should be filed no later than June 25, 1998. Comments must be in English and provided in 20 copies to Gloria Blue, Executive Secretary, Trade Policy Staff Committee, Office of the United States Trade Representative, Room 501, 600 17th Street, Washington, DC 20508. Commenters are requested to submit only non-confidential information and not to submit business confidential information. Non-confidential information received will be available for public inspection by appointment, in the USTR Reading Room, Room 101, Monday through Friday, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon and 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. For an appointment call Brenda Webb on 202–395–6186.

**Frederick L. Montgomery,**

*Chairman, Trade Policy Staff Committee.*

[FR Doc. 98–13880 Filed 5–22–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

## OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

### Initiation of Section 302 Investigation and Request for Public Comment: Mexican Practices Affecting High Fructose Corn Syrup (HFCS)

**AGENCY:** Office of the United States Trade Representative.

**ACTION:** Notice of initiation of investigation and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Trade Representative (USTR) has initiated a Section 301 investigation with respect to certain acts, policies and practices of the Government of Mexico that affect access to the Mexican market for High Fructose Corn Syrup (HFCS). The USTR invites written comments from the public on the matters being investigated and the determinations to be made at the end of that investigation.

**DATES:** This investigation was initiated on May 15, 1998. Written comments from the public are due on or before noon on Friday, June 19, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20508.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Melle, Senior Director, North American Affairs, (202) 395–3412 or Audrey Winter, Associate General Counsel, (202) 395–7305.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On April 2, 1998, the Corn Refiners Association, Inc., filed a petition pursuant to section 302(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, (the Trade Act) (19 U.S.C. 2411) alleging that certain acts, policies and practices of the Government of Mexico affecting HFCS are unreasonable, deny fair and equitable market opportunities for U.S. exporters of HFCS and are actionable under section 301. In particular, the petition alleges the following: In September 1997, with the support and encouragement of the Government of Mexico, representatives of the Mexican sugar industry and the Mexican soft drink bottling industry entered into an agreement to limit the soft drink industry's consumption of HFCS. The purpose and effect of this agreement are to restrict both the volume of HFCS imports from the United States and the manufacture of HFCS by the U.S. companies that have made investments in Mexican production facilities. In exchange for the soft drink industry's limitation of HFCS consumption, the Mexican sugar industry agreed to supply sugar to the soft drink bottlers at discounted, below-market prices. The Government of Mexico is actively