Signed at Washington, DC, this 16th day of November 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

Dennis Puccinelli,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–31551 Filed 11–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 53–98]

Foreign-Trade Zone 216—Olympia, WA; Request for Export Manufacturing Authority, Darigold, Inc. (Dairy/Sugar Food Products)

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the Port of Olympia, grantee of FTZ 216, pursuant to § 400.32(b)(1) of the Board's regulations (15 CFR Part 400), requesting authority on behalf of Darigold, Inc. (Darigold), to manufacture dairy products for export under FTZ procedures within FTZ 216. It was formally filed on November 19, 1998.

Darigold operates a 74,000 square foot dairy product manufacturing facility (37 employees) within FTZ 216-Site 13 located at 67 S.W. Chehalis Avenue in Chehalis, Washington, which recently received FTZ Board authority to process foreign-origin liquid whey permeate under FTZ procedures for export (Board Order 986, 63 FR 35909, 7–1–98). The Port of Olympia is now requesting authority on behalf of Darigold to manufacture dry milk/honey blends, sweetened butter, butter/oil blends, dry coffee whiteners, and ice cream for export. In this activity, about 50 percent of all ingredients used will be sourced from abroad, including whey protein isolate, anhydrous milkfat, caseinate, butter, whey and whey protein concentrate-34, whole and skim milk powder, sugar, honey, glucose, lactose, wheat bran and flour, corn flour, soy flour, rice flour, coconut oil, milk calcium, calcium carbonate, niacin, cocoa, vanilla, tapioca, vegetable oil (soy, canola, corn), and corn sweeteners. All of the finished products would be exported, and none of the foreign ingredients noted above would be entered for U.S. consumption.

FTZ procedures would exempt Darigold from U.S. dairy product and sugar quota requirements and Customs duty payments on the foreign ingredients used in this export activity. The application indicates that the savings from FTZ procedures would help improve the plant's international competitiveness.

The application has requested review under Section 400.32(b)(1) of the FTZ Board regulations based on the export only activity.

Public comment on the application is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and three copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is January 25, 1999. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to February 8, 1999).

A copy of the application will be available for public inspection at the following location: Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 3716, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: November 19, 1998.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–31554 Filed 11–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–549–502]

Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Thailand: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Thailand.

SUMMARY: On October 16, 1998 the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand (63 FR 55578). This review covers the following manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States: Saha Thai Steel Pipe Company, Ltd. (''Saha Thai''), and its affiliated exporter S.A.F. Pipe Export Co., Ltd. (''SAF''). The period of review (POR) is March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997.

On October 16, 1998, pursuant to section 353.28(a) of the Department's regulations, Saha Thai, SAF, and two U.S. importers, Ferro Union, Inc., and Asoma Corporation (collectively, ''Saha Thai'') filed a ministerial error allegation regarding the Department's calculation of importer-specific assessment rates in the final results of the review. In addition, when reviewing Saha Thai's allegation, the Department identified a misstatement in the **Federal Register** notice of the final results. The Department is publishing these amended final results to correct these ministerial errors.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 25, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Totaro, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1374.

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 regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 353 (1997). Although the Department's new regulations, codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998) (''Final Regulations''), do not govern this administrative review, citations to those regulations are provided, where appropriate, as a statement of current Departmental practice.

Ministerial Errors in the Final Results of Review

Where U.S. sales are on an export price (EP) basis and the record does not contain entered value data, the Department's margin calculation program calculates the duty amount to be collected from each importer on a dollars-per-metric ton basis. Because Saha Thai's sales during the POR were all EP sales, the Department's margin calculation program intended to calculate the duty owed for assessment purposes using the methodology described above. Saha Thai alleged that the Department's margin calculation program contained a ministerial error because in calculating the unit duty for each importer, the Department inadvertently increased the quotient of its unit duty calculation by a factor of 100. We examined the margin calculation program, and we agree with Saha Thai that this is a clerical error

within the meaning of 19 CFR 353.28 (d), *i.e.*, an error in arithmetic functions of the calculation program. We have corrected the program so that the result of the unit duty calculation program is no longer multiplied by a factor of 100. This correction affects only the importer-specific assessment rates, not the margin calculated in the final results.

We also note one additional ministerial error not raised by the parties in this review. In the final results **Federal Register** notice, the Department stated that ''[f]or assessment purposes, we have calculated importer-specific duty assessment rates for the merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales during the POR to the total entered value of sales examined during the POR.'' 63 FR at 55590. This statement is incorrect, and does not reflect the margin calculation program disclosed to the parties with the final results of this review. As stated above, the record of this review does not contain data on the entered value of the sales examined during the POR. Therefore, for the final results of this review we calculated the duty amount to be collected from each importer on a unit basis, *i.e.*, a ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales during the POR to the total quantity of sales examined during the POR, not a ratio of antidumping duties to the entered value of these sales.

Amended Final Results of Review

Upon correction of the ministerial errors described above, the margin remains unchanged from the final results published in the **Federal Register** on October 16, 1998. However, as discussed above, the importer-specific assessment rates will change from those disclosed to the parties with the final results. We will instruct the Customs Service accordingly.

Manufacturer/ Exporter	Period	Margin
Saha Thai	3/1/96–2/28/97	1.92%

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department shall issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service. As a result of this review, we have determined that the importer-specific duty assessments rates are necessary. For assessment purposes, therefore, we have calculated importer-specific duty assessment rates for the merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales during the POR to the total quantity of sales examined during the POR.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements shall be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of review for all shipments of certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate 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 these reviews, or the original LTFV investigations, 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 these reviews, the cash deposit rate for this case will continue to be 15.67 percent, the ''All Others'' rate made effective by the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements 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 amended administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and sections 353.22 and 353.28(c) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: November 18, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–31555 Filed 11–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

University of California at Los Angeles; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 98–004R. *Applicant:* University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095–1547. *Instrument:* YAG Pumped Dye Laser. *Manufacturer:* Spectron Laser Systems, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 63 FR 8164, February 18, 1998.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) an internal modular three bar resonator design, (2) operation in ''tophat'' mode to minimize beam divergence and (3) an internal cavity telescope that compensates for the thermal loading on the laser rod. These capabilities are pertinent to the applicant's intended purposes and we know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 98–31552 Filed 11–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

Pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part