several modifications to the disability determination procedures that we normally follow in adjudicating claims for disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act (the Act) and claims for supplemental security income (SSI) payments based on disability under title XVI of the Act. This notice announces the continuation and duration of the testing in a federal processing center. This notice also announces that the selection of cases for this testing will be from a different state.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Harry Pippin, Disability Models Team Leader, Office of Disability, Disability Process Redesign Staff, Social Security Administration, 6401 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, Maryland 21235, 410–965–9203.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Current regulations at 20 CFR 404.906, 404.943, 404.966, 416.1406, 416.1443, and 416.1466 authorize us to test different modifications to the disability determination procedures. On August 1, 1997, we published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 41457) a notice that described the use of four features of the testing modifications to the disability determination procedures, plus two features designed to maximize the resources of a federal processing center. That notice announced that testing of this model would take place at the Social Security Administration's Office of Disability and International Operations in Baltimore, Maryland. Testing was to begin on or about August 11, 1997, and selection of approximately 1,000 claims filed by telephone by residents of Kentucky was to continue for approximately one year with cases processed for an additional six months. We stated that we might choose to extend the duration of the test to obtain additional data, and that we would publish another notice in the **Federal Register** if we decided to extend the duration. We incorporated a fifth modification to the integrated model to the disability determination procedures on September 23, 1997 (62 FR 49598).

We are now announcing that testing in the Office of Disability and International Operations (now called the Office of Central Operations), at 1500 Woodlawn Drive, Baltimore, MD 21241, will be extended for a period of up to one additional year to obtain further data. This test will combine the five process modifications plus the two features designed to maximize the resources of a federal processing center. While selection of Kentucky cases has stopped, the Office of Central Operations continues to adjudicate cases that have been selected already. The Office of Central Operations now will select approximately 400 claims filed by residents of Nevada. Adjudication of the Nevada cases will begin on or about December, 1998. We will continue to select the Nevada cases for at least four months, and may continue to have cases processed for an additional six months after case selection ends. We will publish another notice in the **Federal Register** if we extend the duration of the test or if we select cases from a different state.

Dated: December 15, 1998.

Susan M. Daniels,

Deputy Commissioner for Disability and Income Security Programs.

[FR Doc. 98–34138 Filed 12–23–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4190–29–P

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, as Amended by Pub. L. 104–13; Proposed Collection, Comment Request

AGENCY: Tennessee Valley Authority.

ACTION: Proposed collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: The proposed information collection described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended). The Tennessee Valley Authority is soliciting public comments on this proposed collection as provided by 5 CFR 1320.8(d)(1). Requests for information, including copies of the information collection proposed and supporting documentation, should be directed to the Agency Clearance Officer: Wilma H. McCauley, Tennessee Valley Authority, 1101 Market Street (WR 4Q), Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402–2801; (423) 751–2523.

Comments should be sent to the Agency Clearance Officer no later than February 22, 1999.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Type of Request: Regular submission.

Title of Information Collection: Section 26a Permit Application.

Frequency of Use: On occasion.

Type of Affected Public: Individuals or households, state or local governments, farms, businesses, or other for-profit Federal agencies or employees, non-profit institutions, small businesses or organizations.

Small Businesses or Organizations Affected: Yes.

Federal Budget Functional Category Code: 452.

Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 2600.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 3900.

Estimated Average Burden Hours Per Response: 1.5.

Need For and Use of Information: Section 26a of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, requires that TVA review and approve plans for the construction, operation, and maintenance of any dam, appurtenant works, or other obstruction affecting navigation, flood control, or public lands or reservations across, along, or in the Tennessee River or any of its tributaries. The information collected is used to assess the impact of the proposed project on the statutory TVA programs and determine if the project can be approved. Rules on the application for review and approval of such plans are published in 18 CFR part 1304.

William S. Moore,

Senior Manager, Administrative Services.

[FR Doc. 98–34116 Filed 12–23–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8120–08–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Docket No. WTO/DS–132]

WTO Dispute Settlement Proceeding Regarding Mexico's Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Imports of High Fructose Corn Syrup From the United States

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 127(b)(1) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) (19 U.S.C. 3537(b)(1)), the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) is providing notice that, at the request of the United States, a dispute settlement panel has been established under the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO), to examine Mexico's imposition of antidumping duties on imports of high fructose corn syrup (HFCS) from the United States, and related measures. More specifically, in this dispute the United States alleges that the measures in question are inconsistent with Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT 1994) and Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 12 of the WTO Antidumping Agreement. USTR also invites written comments from the public concerning the issues raised in the dispute.

DATE: Although USTR will accept any comments received during the course of

the dispute settlement proceedings, comments should be submitted on or before January 22, 1999, to be assured of timely consideration by USTR in preparing its first written submission to the panel.

ADDRESS: Comments must be submitted to Sandy McKinzy, Litigation Assistant, Office of Monitoring and Enforcement, Room 122, Attn: Mexico-HFCS Dispute, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mélida Hodgson, Assistant General Counsel, (202) 395–3582.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 8, 1998, the United States requested the establishment of a WTO dispute settlement panel to examine whether Mexico's final antidumping measure, including actions preceding this measure, is inconsistent with the GATT 1994 and the Antidumping Agreement. On November 25, 1998, the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) established a panel to examine the U.S. complaint. Under normal circumstances, the panel, which will hold its meetings in Geneva, Switzerland, would be expected to issue a report detailing its findings and recommendations within six months after it is established.

Major Issues Raised by the United States and Legal Basis of Complaint

In February 1997, at the request of the Mexican Chamber of Sugar and Alcohol Industries (the sugar producers), the Mexican Secretariat of Commerce and Industrial Development (SECOFI) initiated an antidumping investigation of imports of HFCS from the United States. In January 1998, subsequent to the imposition of provisional antidumping duties, SECOFI made a final determination that imports of HFCS from the United States were being dumped in Mexico, and that these imports were threatening the Mexican sugar industry, and it therefore levied antidumping duties against U.S. exporters.

The USTR believes that these measures are inconsistent with key provisions of the WTO agreements in several respects, including the following:

—SECOFI's notice of initiation of an antidumping investigation did not provide adequate information summarizing the factors on which the allegation of threat of material injury was based;

—The evidence in the application alleging threat of material injury was insufficient to justify initiation of an investigation;

—In its final determination of threat of material injury to the sugar industry, Mexico failed to properly examine, and determine, the likely impact of dumped HFCS imports on the Mexican sugar industry;

—Mexico's determination that there was a likelihood of substantially increased imports or that further dumped imports were imminent was flawed;

—Mexico's application and administration of provisional antidumping measures was inconsistent with the Antidumping Agreement; and

—U.S. exporters were denied a full opportunity to defend their intersts during the pendency of Mexico's investigation

Public Comment: Requirements for Submissions

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning the issues raised in the dispute. Comments must be English and provided in fifteen copies. A person requesting that information contained in a comment submitted by that person be treated as confidential business information must certify that such information is business confidential and would not customarily be released to the public by the commenter. Confidential business information must be clearly marked ''BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL'' in a contrasting color ink at the top of each page of each copy.

Information or advice contained in a comment submitted, other than business confidential information, may be determined by USTR to be confidential in accordance with section 135(g)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(g)(2)). If the submitter believes that information or advice may qualify as such, the submitter—

(1) Must so designate that information or advice;

(2) Must clearly mark the material as ''SUBMITTED IN CONFIDENCE'' in a contrasting color ink at the top of each page of each copy; and

(3) Is encouraged to provide a non-confidential summary of the information or advice.

Pursuant to to section 127(e) of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3537(e)), USTR will maintain a file on this dispute settlement proceeding, accessible to the public, in the USTR Reading Room: Room 101, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington DC 20508. The public file will include a listing of any comments received by USTR from the public with respect to the proceeding; the U.S. submissions to the panel in the proceeding; the submissions, or non-confidential summaries of submissions, to the panel received from other participants in the dispute, as well as the report of the dispute settlement panel and, if applicable, the report of the Appellate Body. An appointment to review the public file (Docket WTO/DS–132) (''Mexico-HFCS Dispute'') may be made by calling Brenda Webb, (202) 395–6186. The USTR Reading Room is open to the public from 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon and 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

A. Jane Bradley,

Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for Monitoring and Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 98–34134 Filed 12–23–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Reports, Forms and Recordkeeping Requirements

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice lists those forms, reports, and recordkeeping requirements imposed upon the public which were transmitted by the Department of Transportation to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for its approval in accordance with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 USC Chapter 35). Section 3507 of Title 44 of the United States Code, requires that agencies prepare a notice for publication in the **Federal Register**, listing information collection request submitted to OMB for approval or renewal under that Act. OMB reviews and approves agency submissions in accordance with criteria set forth in that Act. In carrying out its responsibilities, OMB also considers public comments on the proposed forms and the reporting and recordkeeping requirements. OMB approval of an information collection requirement must be renewed at least once every three years.

The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on information collection 2132–0502 was published on August 25, 1998 [63 FR 45281].

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received on or before January 25, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: A copy of the DOT information collection request submitted to OMB may be obtained from Ms. Sue Masselink, Office