

- 40 NSC Documents: Postponed in Part until 10/2017  
 392 US ARMY Documents: Postponed in Part until 10/2017

#### Notice of Other Releases

After consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, the Review Board

announces that documents from the following agencies are now being opened in full: 1087 FBI documents; 4 Ford Library documents; 48 NSC documents; 10 U.S. Army (Califano) documents; 302 U.S. Army (IRR) documents.

#### Notice of Corrections

On December 15, 1997 the Review Board made formal determinations that were published in the December 24, 1997 Federal Register (FR Doc. 97-33529, 60 FR 12345). For that Notice make the following corrections:

Record identification number	Previously published	Corrected data
119-10021-10357 .....	1; 10/2017 .....	0; n/a
119-10022-10395 .....	1; 10/2017 .....	0; n/a
119-10022-10074 .....	1; 10/2017 .....	0; n/a

Dated: July 22, 1998.

**T. Jeremy Gunn,**

*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc. 98-20092 Filed 7-23-98; 11:27 am]

BILLING CODE 6118-01-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce (DOC) has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 USC Chapter 35).

*Agency:* National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

*Title:* Applications and Reports for Registration as a Tanner or Agent.

*Agency Form Number(s):* None.

*OMB Approval Number:* 0648-0179.

*Type of Request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Burden:* 154 hours.

*Number of Respondents:* 77.

*Avg. Hours Per Response:* 2 hours.

*Needs and Uses:* The Marine Mammal Protection Act exempts Alaskan natives from the prohibitions from taking, killing, or injuring marine mammals without a permit or exemption if the taking is done for subsistence or for creating and selling authentic native articles of handicraft or clothing. Non-natives who wish to act as a tanner or an agent for such products must register with NOAA and submit certain records. The information obtained is used for law enforcement purposes.

*Affected Public:* Businesses or other for-profit organizations.

*Frequency:* On occasion, annually.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Required to obtain or retain benefits.

*OMB Desk Officer:* David Rostker, (202) 395-3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier, DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202)

482-3272, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: July 22, 1998.

**Linda Engelmeier,**

*Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98-19940 Filed 7-24-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce (DOC) has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 USC Chapter 35).

*Agency:* National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

*Title:* Western Alaska Community Development Quota Program.

*Agency Form Number(s):* None.

*OMB Approval Number:* 0648-0269.

*Type of Request:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Burden:* 3,495 hours.

*Number of Respondents:* 59.

*Avg. Hours Per Response:* Ranges between 4 and 520 hours depending on the requirement.

*Needs and Uses:* The collection of information is needed to administer and manage harvests of groundfish and halibut under the Western Alaska Community Development Quota (CDQ) Program for the groundfish fisheries off Alaska. The information collected will be used to determine whether communities applying for allocations under the CDQ program meet

administrative requirements, whether vessels and processors harvesting CDQ species meet equipment and operational requirements, and to monitor whether quotas have been harvested or exceeded.

*Affected Public:* Not-for-profit institutions, businesses or other for-profit organizations, state, local or tribal government.

*Frequency:* On occasion, weekly, annually, recordkeeping.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Required to obtain or retain benefits.

*OMB Desk Officer:* David Rostker, (202) 395-3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier, DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482-3272, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: July 22, 1998.

**Linda Engelmeier,**

*Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98-19941 Filed 7-24-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### International Trade Administration

[A-351-820]

##### Amended Order and Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Ferrosilicon From Brazil

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

**ACTION:** Amendment to Final Determination of Antidumping Duty

# Investigation in Accordance with Decision upon Remand.

**SUMMARY:** On July 20, 1995, the United States Court of International Trade (the CIT) remanded to the Department of Commerce (the Department) the final determination and the amended final determination in the antidumping duty investigation of ferrosilicon from Brazil. See *Aimcor et al. v. United States et al.*, Slip Op. 95-130 (CIT July 20, 1995). On January 17, 1996, the Department filed its results of redetermination pursuant to the CIT's order, and on May 21, 1996, the CIT affirmed the Final Remand Determination. That decision was appealed. The petitioner cross-appealed. On April 9, 1998, the CAFC affirmed the decision of the CIT. As there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this action, we will instruct the Customs Service to collect a cash deposit of 42.17 percent for subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice, from "all other" manufacturers, producers or exporters. The cash deposit rates calculated for CBCC and Minasligas as a result of the remand have been superseded by subsequent administrative reviews for these companies.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 27, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kate Johnson or David J. Goldberger, Office 5, 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) 482-4929 or (202) 482-4136, respectively.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions in effect as of December 31, 1994. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 353 (1994).

### Background

On January 6, 1994, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the *Final Determination of Sales at Less-Than-Fair-Value: Ferrosilicon from Brazil* (59 FR 732) (*Final Determination*). On February 23, 1994, the Department published the *Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less-Than-Fair-Value: Ferrosilicon from Brazil* (59 FR 8598) (*Amended Final Determination*). Subsequently, AIMCOR

and Minasligas filed lawsuits with the CIT, challenging the Department's final determination and amended final determination.

On July 20, 1995, the CIT remanded to the Department the *Final Determination and Amended Final Determination*. See *Aimcor, Alabama Silicon, Inc., American Alloys, Inc., Globe Metallurgical, Inc., and American Silicon Technologies v. United States and Companhia Ferroligas Minas Gerais-Minasligas*, Slip Op. 95-130 (CIT July 20, 1995). In its remand instructions, the CIT upheld the Department's reduction of home market price by the inflation premium (we determined that the home market price erroneously included an adjustment for anticipated inflation that did not permit a contemporaneous comparison of the home market price at the time of shipment to the replacement cost in the month of shipment) but directed the Department to determine if the amount of the "spread" (the difference between the interest rate and the inflation rate) was sufficiently quantified and, if so, to account for this amount in the home market price. If this data was not found to be sufficiently quantified, the Department was to grant Minasligas an opportunity to provide such data. We determined that the spread reported by Minasligas was not the most appropriate measure of inflation in this case. We used the monthly Wholesale Price Index because it more closely reflected the price increases experienced by the producer due to inflation. Second, the CIT stated that the Department must reconsider its profit calculation in CV because in this hyperinflationary situation, the Department calculated profit based upon an imputed home market credit expense that may be totally unrelated to an appropriate CV. The Court further stated that the Department must explain the rationale for whatever methodology it chose to apply. We recalculated profit after using the weighted average of home market spreads as imputed credit for CV because the spreads most accurately reflect the real interest rate charged to customers during the payment period. Third, the CIT instructed the Department to apply a U.S. dollar-denominated interest rate in calculating Minasligas' imputed U.S. credit expenses. We determined that the company's only evidence of U.S. borrowing is an aircraft lease and, therefore, the only evidence of what credit terms this company would encounter when borrowing in U.S. dollars. Accordingly, for purposes of imputed credit expenses, we used the

interest rate on the aircraft lease. Fourth, the CIT directed the Department to request from Minasligas data on the appropriate monetary correction for loans, and if that data was inadequate or not provided, to reconsider our selection of best information available. Also, we were to reconsider whether the Department's interest expense adjustment and the selection, if any, of an adjustment for monetary correction for loans understated Minasligas' interest expenses included in COP and CV. We recalculated the net interest expense ratio for the combined companies (Delp and Minasligas) based on the actual interest expense incurred consistent with our normal methodology. We restated the cost of sales used in the denominator of the net interest expense ratio by using the wholesale price inflation index. We applied the actual interest expense ratio to the replacement cost of manufacturing for each month of the period of investigation. Fifth, the CIT directed the Department to determine whether Minasligas' value-added taxes on the inputs at issue were fully recovered prior to exportation of the subject merchandise. On September 13, 1995, the CIT determined that the fifth issue also pertained to CBCC. The parties were unable to submit data to enable us to determine whether the taxes paid on inputs for any specific sale were recovered. Therefore, there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the taxes were fully recovered and we considered them a cost and included them in the cost of production.

On January 17, 1996, the Department filed its results of redetermination pursuant to the CIT's remand. As a result of the redetermination upon remand, the dumping margin for Minasligas changed from 3.46 percent to 19.73 percent, the dumping margin for CBCC changed from 15.53 to 17.93 percent, and the All Others rate changed from 35.95 to 42.17 percent. On May 21, 1996, the CIT affirmed the Department's results of the remand redetermination. See *AIMCOR v. United States*, Slip Op. 96-79 (CIT May 21, 1996). That decision was appealed by both AIMCOR and Minasligas. Specifically, Minasligas challenged the inclusion of Brazilian value-added taxes as part of the cost of materials in determining CV. AIMCOR cross-appealed, challenging the interest rate used by the Department to calculate Minasligas' U.S. credit expenses. On April 9, 1998, the CAFC affirmed the decision of the CIT. As there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this action, we are amending our

amended final determination in this matter.

### Amended Final Determination

Pursuant to section 19 U.S.C. 1516A(e) of the Act, we are now amending the amended final determination on the antidumping duty order on ferrosilicon from Brazil. As a result of the remand redetermination, the recalculated final weighted-average margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/ producer/ex- porter	Customers ID No.	Margin percent- age
CBCC .....	A-351-820-001	17.93
Minasligas .....	A-351-820-003	19.73
All Others .....	A-351-820-000	42.17

### Assessment Instructions

On January 19, 1996, the Court granted an injunction preventing liquidation of entries made on or after August 16, 1993, at the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) or amended LTFV cash deposit rates for CBCC, Minasligas, as well as "all others" (except Italmagnesio S.A. Industria e Comercio, which was not covered by the injunction), and required that any unreviewed entries be liquidated at the rates determined in the litigation. We will, therefore, instruct Customs to liquidate unreviewed entries of Minasligas, CBCC and "all others," which were entered at the LTFV cash deposit rates, at the rates listed above.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with section 736(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.20(a)(4)(1994).

Dated: July 17, 1998.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-20013 Filed 7-24-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-588-836]

### Polyvinyl Alcohol From Japan: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of changed circumstances antidumping duty review, and revocation in part of antidumping duty order.

**SUMMARY:** On April 30, 1998, the Department published a notice of initiation of a changed circumstances antidumping duty review and preliminary results of the review with intent to revoke, in part, the antidumping duty order on polyvinyl alcohol from Japan. On June 16, 1998, the Department published a notice amending the preliminary results of the changed circumstances antidumping duty review, the scope of which included polyvinyl alcohol for use in the manufacture of an excipient or as an excipient in the manufacture of film coating systems which are components of a drug or dietary supplement. We are now revoking this order in part, with regard to polyvinyl alcohol from Japan for use in the manufacture of an excipient or as an excipient in the manufacture of film coating systems which are components of a drug or dietary supplement, based on the fact that domestic parties have expressed no further interest in the relief provided by the order with respect to the importation or sale of polyvinyl alcohol for use in the manner prescribed above.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 27, 1998.

### *The Applicable Statute*

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's ("the Department") regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR Part 351, 62 FR 27296 (May 19, 1997).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Smith or Brian Ledgerwood, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-1766 or (202) 482-3836, respectively.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### **Background**

On March 12, 1998, Colorcon, Inc. ("Colorcon") requested that the Department conduct a changed circumstances review and revoke, in part, the antidumping duty order with respect to polyvinyl alcohol ("PVA") from Japan for use in the manufacture of an excipient or as an excipient in the manufacture of film coating systems which are components of a drug or dietary supplement. Colorcon included in its request a statement from the

petitioner dated October 30, 1997, expressing (i) no objection to a changed circumstances review, and (ii) no further interest in maintaining the antidumping duty order with respect to PVA imported from Japan for use in the manner described above.

We preliminarily determined that the petitioner's affirmative statement of no interest constituted changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review and partial revocation of this order. Consequently, on April 30, 1998, the Department published a notice of initiation and preliminary results of changed circumstances antidumping duty review with an intent to revoke this order in part (63 FR 23722). In that notice, we stated that we intend to revoke in part, the antidumping duty order as it relates to "imports of PVA for use as a pharmaceutical excipient or for use in the manufacture of film coating systems which are components of a drug or dietary supplement." Subsequently, it came to the Department's attention that our description of the type of PVA subject to the proposed revocation did not accurately reflect the description contained in the petitioner's expression of no further interest. In particular, the Department's description of the product subject to revocation did not include PVA "for use in the manufacture of an excipient." As a result, we amended our preliminary results published on April 30, 1998, to clarify our description of the type of PVA subject to the proposed revocation. On June 16, 1998, the Department published a notice amending the preliminary results of the changed circumstances antidumping duty review with an intent to revoke the order in part (63 FR 32809). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the amended preliminary results of this changed circumstances review. We received no comments.

### **Scope of Review**

The product covered by this review is PVA. PVA is a dry, white to cream-colored, water-soluble synthetic polymer. Excluded from this review are PVAs covalently bonded with acetoacetylate, carboxylic acid, or sulfonic acid uniformly present on all polymer chains in a concentration equal to or greater than two mole percent, and PVAs covalently bonded with silane uniformly present on all polymer chains in a concentration equal to or greater than one-tenth of one mole percent. PVA in fiber form is not included in the scope of this review.

The merchandise under review is currently classifiable under subheading 3905.30.00 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States*