

This was one of five potential pilots being considered. GIPSA received 41 comments. Seven specifically talked about the pilot programs for barges. Of those seven, five supported the program for barges, and two did not.

Subsequently, GIPSA determined that this proposed pilot program was too narrow in scope for the initial round of pilot programs.

Subsequently, some official agencies expressed their belief that a pilot program on the Mississippi River would be beneficial because there is some uncertainty over the boundary lines between official agencies along the Mississippi River. At one point GIPSA considered the boundary to be the middle of a river. Official agencies found this very difficult to work with, and GIPSA subsequently changed the boundary definition to the edge of a river. The middle of a river was viewed as an open area to be served by either contiguous official agency.

In 1993, because of flooding along the Mississippi River, GIPSA granted a temporary exception for certain types of barge inspections along portions of the Illinois, Mississippi, and Missouri Rivers. This exception made the covered river areas open to any official agency for probe sampling and inspections to expedite barge traffic. GIPSA noted no problems resulting from this exception.

In addition, some facilities located along the Mississippi River (Birds Point Terminal, Bertrand, Missouri; Peavey Company, St. Louis, Missouri; ADM, Winona, Minnesota; and Consolidated Grain, Caruthersville, Missouri) have received services from alternative official agencies under the existing pilot programs. There have been no significant problems resulting from the barge inspections on the Mississippi River under the existing pilot programs.

GIPSA announced and invited comments on the following four possible pilot programs in the October 10, 1997, **Federal Register** (62 FR 52967).

1. Barges on the Mississippi River may be sampled by probe by any official agency; or

2. Barges on the Mississippi River may be sampled by probe at any location by the official agency designated to serve the geographic area within which the barge was loaded; or

3. Barges on all rivers may be sampled by probe by any official agency; or

4. Barges on all rivers may be sampled by probe at any location by the official agency designated to serve the geographic area within which the barge was loaded.

Comments were due by November 15, 1997. GIPSA received seven comments:

five from official agencies (two private and three States) and two from trade organizations. Four official agencies supported option 4 and one supported option 2. Both options 2 and 4 would limit the pilot program to the official agency serving the area within which the barge was loaded. Option 2 is further limited to the Mississippi River while option 4 covers all rivers nationwide. The official agencies cited their belief that options 2 and 4 would provide more flexibility to the grain industry, and their concern that options 1 and 3 would weaken the official system. Allowing unrestricted access to grain barges would cause their fixed cost to rise as high inspection volume customers are lost and they are left with the responsibility of providing service to infrequent users of official services. This, they believe, would encourage official agencies to focus on serving high volume customers and encourage customers to look for better grades. Official agencies would tend to become national, contract with one large customer, and lose integrity and impartiality.

One of the three State official agencies did not favor projects opening up agency geographic areas while the other two State official agencies supported option 2 and 4 respectively. The State official agencies noted other concerns including their limitations on travel, inability to add or decrease staff quickly, and their stronger neutrality and integrity base on non-profit status compared to most private official agencies.

GIPSA recognizes these concerns, but believes that there are adequate safeguards in the proposed pilot programs.

Two national grain trade organizations supported option 3. Option 3 would allow barges, nationwide, to be probe-sampled by any official agency no matter where it is located or where it was loaded. These two organizations cited their belief that option 3 would provide grain handlers another option for obtaining timely official inspection services when the official agency serving them is busy. It would, they believe, provide better access to service, and foster official agency emphasis on quality and efficiency. They also believed that market driven-competition can effectively and efficiently address many of the factors that discourage use of the domestic official inspection system. They believe the other proposed pilot programs would be too limited in scope.

After consideration of all relevant information, GIPSA is announcing that effective March 1, 1998, and ending

October 31, 1999, concurrently with the two existing pilot programs, barges on all rivers may be sampled by probe by any official agency. During this time, GIPSA will monitor all pilot programs. Anytime, GIPSA determines that a pilot program is having a negative impact on the official system or is not working as intended, the pilot program may be modified or discontinued. If GIPSA determines that a customer violates the provisions of this pilot program, such customer will no longer be permitted to participate in the program.

Official agencies participating in this pilot program must notify GIPSA's Compliance Division at 202-720-8525 or FAX 202-690-2755 any time they sample a barge outside their assigned geographic area.

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

Dated: January 9, 1998.

Neil E. Porter,

Director, Compliance Division.

[FR Doc. 98-921 Filed 1-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-EN-P

ASSASSINATION RECORDS REVIEW BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

DATE: January 22, 1998.

PLACE: ARRB, 600 E Street, NW., Washington, DC.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Review and Accept Minutes of Closed Meetings.
2. Review of Assassination Records.
3. Other Business.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Eileen Sullivan, Press Officer, 600 E Street, NW; Second Floor, Washington, DC 20530. Telephone: (202) 724-0088; Fax: (202) 724-0457.

T. Jeremy Gunn,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 98-1086 Filed 1-12-98; 4:21 pm]

BILLING CODE 6118-01-P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the Massachusetts Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene at 10:30 a.m. and adjourn at 3:00 p.m. on

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 its 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 its 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