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, February 8, 1999.

**Carol-Lee Hurley,**

*Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.*

[FR Doc. 99–3675 Filed 2–16–99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6335–01–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## International Trade Administration

**[A–122–822, A–122–823]**

## Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Canada: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Determination to Revoke in Part

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Amended Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Canada and Determination to Revoke in Part.

**SUMMARY:** We are amending our final results of the 1996–97 administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on Certain Corrosion Resistant Carbon Steel Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Canada and Determination to Revoke in Part, published on January 13, 1999 (64 FR 2173), to reflect the correction of ministerial errors made in the model match and margin calculation in the final results for corrosion resistant carbon flat products, and in the *Final Results of Review* section of the notice for plate. We are publishing this amendment to the final results in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 16, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Elfi Blum or Maureen Flannery, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0197 or (202) 482–3020, respectively.

### Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise stated, 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 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (1998).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

On July 10, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its 1996–97 administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products and certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada. We published the final results of review on January 13, 1999 (64 FR 2173). On January 22, 1999, we received a timely allegation from petitioners (Bethlehem Steel Corporation, U.S. Steel Group (a unit of USX Corporation), Inland Steel Industries, Inc., Gulf States Steel Inc. of Alabama, Sharon Steel Corporation, Geneva Steel, and Lukens Steel Company) that the Department made ministerial errors in the final results. On January 27, 1998, respondent, Dofasco, Inc. and Sorevco, Inc. (collectively Dofasco), filed a response to petitioners' comments on ministerial errors.

### Scope of Review

The products covered by these administrative reviews constitute two separate ''classes or kinds'' of merchandise: (1) certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products, and (2) certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate.

The first class or kind, certain corrosion-resistant steel, includes flat-rolled carbon steel products, of rectangular shape, either clad, plated, or coated with corrosion-resistant metals such as zinc, aluminum, or zinc-, aluminum-, nickel- or iron-based alloys, whether or not corrugated or painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers) and of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, or in straight lengths which, if of a thickness less than 4.75 millimeters, are of a width of 0.5 inch or greater and which measures at least 10 times the thickness or if of a thickness of 4.75 millimeters or more are of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) under item numbers 7210.30.0030, 7210.30.0060, 7210.41.0000, 7210.49.0030, 7210.49.0090, 7210.61.0000, 7210.69.0000, 7210.70.6030, 7210.70.6060, 7210.70.6090, 7210.90.1000, 7210.90.6000, 7210.90.9000, 7212.20.0000, 7212.30.1030, 7212.30.1090, 7212.30.3000, 7212.30.5000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000, 7212.60.0000, 7215.90.1000, 7215.90.3000, 7215.90.5000, 7217.20.1500, 7217.30.1530, 7217.30.1560, 7217.90.1000, 7217.90.5030, 7217.90.5060, and 7217.90.5090. Included in this review are corrosion-resistant flat-rolled products of non-rectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (i.e., products which have been ''worked after rolling'')—for example, products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges. Excluded from this review are flat-rolled steel products either plated or coated with tin, lead, chromium, chromium oxides, both tin and lead (''terne plate''), or both chromium and chromium oxides (''tin-free steel''), whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating. Also excluded from this review are clad products in straight lengths of 0.1875 inch or more in composite thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness. Also excluded from this review are certain clad stainless flat-rolled products, which are three-layered corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat-rolled products less than 4.75 millimeters in composite thickness that consist of a carbon steel flat-rolled product clad on both sides with stainless steel in a 20%–60%–20% ratio.

The second class or kind, certain cut-to-length plate, includes hot-rolled carbon steel universal mill plates (i.e., flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 millimeters but not exceeding 1,250 millimeters and of a thickness of not less than 4 millimeters, not in coils and without patterns in relief), of rectangular shape, neither clad, plated nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances; and certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat-rolled products in straight lengths, of rectangular shape, hot rolled, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not

painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, 4.75 millimeters or more in thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the HTS under item numbers 7208.40.3030, 7208.40.3060, and 7208.51.0030, 7208.51.0045, 7208.51.0060, 7208.52.0000, 7208.53.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.13.0000, 7211.14.0030, 7211.14.0045, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000. Included in this review are flat-rolled products of non-rectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (i.e., products which have been ''worked after rolling'')—for example, products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges. Excluded from this review is grade X–70 plate. Also excluded is cut-to-length carbon steel plate meeting the following criteria: (1) 100% dry steel plates, virgin steel, no scrap content (free of Cobalt-60 and other radioactive nuclides); (2) .290 inches maximum thickness, plus 0.0, minus .030 inches; (3) 48.00 inch wide, plus .05, minus 0.0 inches; (4) 10 foot lengths, plus 0.5, minus 0.0 inches; (5) flatness, plus/minus 0.5 inch over 10 feet; (6) AISI 1006; (7) tension leveled; (8) pickled and oiled; and (9) carbon content, 0.3 to 0.8 (maximum).

With respect to both classes or kinds, the HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive of the scope of these reviews.

**Amended Final Results**

On January 22, 1999, petitioners alleged that the Department made ministerial errors in calculating the final antidumping duty margin with respect to Dofasco, one of the respondents in the review of corrosion-resistant steel. Petitioners alleged that the fields referenced in certain lines of the model match section of the program do not correspond to the fields established earlier in the program to weight the various reduction processes. We agree that we did not use the proper values for the weights for the reduction process, to coincide with the reporting requirements reflected in the Department's letter to respondent of November 7, 1997. We have amended the final results by replacing the incorrect values of the weights with the correct ones.

We also agree with petitioners that we incorrectly calculated the total U.S. direct selling expenses before we calculated a revised U.S. credit expense in the margin calculation program. Dofasco commented that petitioners failed to take into consideration the currency conversion calculation in their proposed language for the credit expense calculation. We have moved the revised credit expense calculation so that the revised credit expenses will be included in the calculation of the U.S. direct selling expenses. We further agree with petitioner that the program did not adjust for missing values in the actual payment days field. We have changed the language in the margin program to include the missing values. We also agree with Dofasco's comment, however, and our credit calculation reflects currency conversion. As a result of these corrections, the margin for corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Canada for Dofasco has changed from 0.98 percent to 1.00 percent. No other margins were affected.

We also note that the Department inadvertently included Stelco Inc. (Stelco) in its language concerning the revocation of the antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada in the *Final Results of the Review* section of the final results notice. As clearly outlined in the section *Determination Not to Revoke in Part: Stelco Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate and Corrosion-Resistant Steel Flat Products, and Determination to Revoke in Part: Algoma Cut-To-Length Carbon Steel Plate*, and our response to petitioners' comment 2, we are not revoking the order in part with respect to Stelco.

**Amended Final Results of Review**

Upon review of the submitted allegation, the Department has determined that the following margins exist for the period August 1, 1996, through July 31, 1997:

| Manufacturer/exporter | Margin (percent) |
|---|---|
| Corrosion Resistant Steel: | |
| Dofasco | 1.00 |
| CCC | 2.26 |
| Stelco | 2.73 |
| Cut-to-Length Plate: | |
| Algoma | *0.23 |
| MRM | 0.00 |
| Stelco | 0.00 |
| Forsyth | 68.70 |

**De minimis.*

The Department will determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. For assessment purposes, we have calculated importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rates for the merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total quantity of sales examined. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for each reviewed company will be the rates stated above (except that no deposit will be required for firms with zero or *de minimis* margins, *i.e.*, margins less than 0.5 percent); (2) for exporters not covered in this review, but covered in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation or a previous review, 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 this review, a previous review, or the original LTFV investigation, 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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the ''all others'' rates established in the LTFV investigations, which were 18.71 percent for corrosion-resistant steel products and 61.88 percent for plate (*see Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value and Anti-Dumping Orders: Certain Corrosion Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Canada*, 60 FR 49582 (September 26, 1995)). These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative reviews.

We are revoking the antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada with respect to Algoma, in accordance with section 751(d) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.25(a)(2). In accordance with 19 CFR 351.222(f)(3), this revocation applies to all entries of the subject merchandise from Canada entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after August 1, 1997. This date is a correction from the date stated in our notice of final results. The Department will order the suspension of liquidation ended for all such entries and will instruct the Customs Service to release any bonds and refund with interest any cash deposits on entries made on or after August 1, 1997.

These administrative reviews and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1) and 19 CFR 351.213 and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5).

Date: February 4, 1999.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99–3693 Filed 2–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A–570–840]**

### Manganese Metal From the People's Republic of China; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of amended final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on manganese metal from the People's Republic of China.

**SUMMARY:** On March 13, 1998, the Department of Commerce published (62 FR 12440) the final results and partial rescission of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on manganese metal from the People's Republic of China. The review covered the period June 14, 1995 through January 31, 1997. Subsequent to the publication of the final results, we received comments from both petitioners and respondents alleging various ministerial errors. After analyzing the comments submitted, we are amending our final results to correct certain ministerial errors. This amendment to the final results is published in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 16, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Gregory Campbell or Cynthia Thirumalai; Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Group I, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce; 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone numbers (202) 482–2239 or (202) 482–4087, respectively.

### Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act''), as amended, 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''). Additionally, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR 353 (April 1997).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

On March 13, 1998, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published in the **Federal Register** the final results and partial rescission of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order covering the period of June 14, 1995 through January 31, 1997 on manganese metal from the People's Republic of China (''PRC''). See Manganese Metal from the People's Republic of China; Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 63 FR 12440 (March 13, 1998) (''Final Results of Review''). Subsequently, the following parties submitted ministerial error allegations: Elkem Metals Company and Kerr-McGee Chemical Corporation (together comprising the ''petitioners''), and China Hunan International Economic Development Corporation (''HIED'') and China Metallurgical Import & Export Hunan Corporation/Hunan Nonferrous Metals Import & Export Associated Corporation (''CMIECHN/CNIECHN'') (together comprising the ''respondents'').

On April 9, 1998 the petitioners filed a summons with the Court of International Trade (''CIT''), and in a subsequent complaint dated May 11, 1998 challenged the Department's final results of the administrative review. The Department, therefore, suspended any action on the ministerial error allegations until the CIT issued, on November 4, 1998, an order of dismissal of the petitioners' complaint.

A summary of each allegation along with the Department's response is included below. We are hereby amending our final results, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.28(c), to reflect the correction of those errors which are clerical in nature.

### Analysis of Comments Received

*Allegation 1:* The petitioners argue that the Department erred in its calculation of the value of Factors A and K.[1] In order to adjust the factor prices to a period contemporaneous with the period of review (''POR''), the Department multiplied each surrogate value by the change in world-traded prices between 1993, the period for which the surrogate value is quoted, and the Japanese fiscal year 1995. (As explained in the Final Results of Review, we used as a proxy for world-traded ore prices the annual contract price in Japan of high-grade manganese ore.) The petitioners note that the record contains world-traded ore prices for 1996 as well. The petitioners argue that, because the POR is June 14, 1995 through January 31, 1997, the Department should have used an average of the 1995 and 1996 world-traded prices, as this would be more representative of the prices in effect throughout the duration of the POR.

The respondents counter that the petitioners' argument involves a deliberate choice by the Department about methodology and, therefore, does not properly fall within the definition of ministerial error. The respondents further note that the petitioners themselves in their submission acknowledge that this point is methodological in nature.

*Department's Position:* We agree with the respondents. The petitioners' argument involves a methodological decision by the Department and, as such, does not constitute a ministerial error. This methodology is clearly identified in the Final Results of Review and in the Calculation Memorandum. Thus, no revision has been made.

*Allegation 2:* The petitioners argue that the Department's choice of a surrogate ore from ''Producer X'' for valuing Factor B is inferior to the petitioners' proposed surrogate from Sandur Manganese & Iron Ores Ltd. based on a comparison of the manganese-to-iron ratios of the two.

The respondents counter that the petitioners' argument involves a deliberate choice by the Department about methodology and, therefore, does not properly fall within the definition of ministerial error.

*Department's Position:* We agree with the respondents. The Department's choice of any one surrogate value over alternative values does not represent a ministerial error. The selection of appropriate surrogate values for manganese ore in this case has been a highly contentious issue. During the course of the administrative review, the Department considered all of the arguments presented by the parties, in favor of and opposed to each ore surrogate alternative. Our reasons for choosing the ore from ''Producer X'' to value Factor B have been clearly

[1] A key to the naming convention for business proprietary factors of production is included as Exhibit J of the Memorandum to the File: Calculations for the Final Results of Review (March 9, 1998) (''Calculation Memorandum''). A public version of this document is available in the Department's Central Records Unit, Room B–099.