presumably represents have failed to respond.

In conclusion, the Associations argue that the Department should determine that a full review in this case was unnecessary and unwarranted.

Department's Position: We disagree. The Department's regulations do not require that the Department conduct an expedited review. Rather, the regulations provide that the Department *normally* will conduct an expedited review where it does not receive adequate response, where adequate response is described as responses from parties accounting for more than 50 percent of the volume of exports over the five years preceding initiation of the sunset review. The Department *must* conduct an expedited sunset review of a countervailing duty order only when the foreign government does not participate.

Unlike other countervailing duty investigations or reviews, where company-specific information is required in order to measure the amount of countervailable subsidy, the subsidy rate from the only program investigated over the life of this order has consistently been determined without the need for, or use of, company-specific information. Because adequacy determinations are made for the purpose of determining whether there is sufficient participation to warrant a full review, in a case such as this, where company-specific information provides no additional input into our determinations, we believe that requiring producer/exporter participation is not warranted. Therefore, in this sunset review, we continue to believe that the response of the EC forms an adequate basis for conducting a full review to determine whether revocation of the countervailing duty order on sugar from the EC will likely lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy and, if so, what the level of the net countervailable subsidy would be.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the countervailing duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy for the reasons set forth in the preliminary results of review. For the reasons set forth in the preliminary results of review, we continue to determine the country-wide net countervailable subsidy in terms of cents per pound. However, for this final, we find the net countervailable subsidy likely to prevail if the order were revoked is 23.69 cents per pound. Although qualifying as a countervailable export subsidy, Articles 3 and 6 of the Subsidies Agreement do not apply to the export restitution payments program under the EC's CAP.

This five-year (''sunset'') review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: August 27, 1999.

Bernard T. Carreau,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–23040 Filed 9–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 082699B]

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) will convene a public meeting of the Florida/Alabama Habitat Protection Advisory Panel (AP).

DATES: The meeting will begin at a.m. on Tuesday, September 28, 1999 and conclude by p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Hilton Tampa Aiport Westshore, 2225 Lois Avenue, Tampa, FL 33607; telephone: 813–877–6688.

Council address: Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 3018 U.S. Highway 301 North, Suite 1000, Tampa, FL 33619.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Rester, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; telephone: 228–875–5912.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Florida/Alabama group is part of a three unit Habitat Protection Advisory Panel of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. The principal role of the advisory panels is to assist the Council in attempting to maintain optimum conditions within the habitat and ecosystems supporting the marine resources of the Gulf of Mexico. Advisory panels serve as a first alert system to call to the Council's attention proposed projects being developed and other activities which may adversely impact the Gulf marine fisheries and their supporting ecosystems. The panels may also provide advice to the Council on its policies and procedures for addressing environmental affairs.

At this meeting, the AP will discuss revision of the Council's Habitat Policy to include essential fish habitat (EFH) provisions, an update on EFH assessments in Council fishery management plan amendments, an update on the status of the EFH lawsuit, impact of two new gas pipelines between Mobile, AL and central Florida, status of the new marine reserves off the Florida panhandle, and an update on Alabama's expansion of their artificial reef zone.

Although other issues not on the agenda may come before the AP for discussion, in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, those issues may not be the subject of formal action during this meeting. The AP's actions will be restricted to those issues specifically identified in the agenda listed as available by this notice.

Special Accommodations

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Anne Alford at the Council (see **ADDRESSES**) by September 21, 1999.

Dated: September 7, 1999.

Bruce C. Morehead,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 99–23798 Filed 9–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

DEPARMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 090799B]

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council; Public Meetings

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) will hold a public meeting with the limited access permit holders in the golden crab fishery in the South Atlantic region.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Monday, September 27, 1999, from 1:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Best Western, 411 South Krome, Florida City, FL 33034; telephone: 305-246-5100.

Council address: South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, One Southpark Circle, Suite 306; Charleston, SC 29407-4699.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Mahood, Executive Director; telephone: (843) 571-4366; fax: (843) 769-4520; email: robert.mahood@noaa.gov

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of this meeting is for Council staff to meet with the limited access permit holders in the golden crab fishery to gather information in preparation for Amendment 1 to the Golden Crab Fishery Management Plan.

Although other issues not contained in this agenda may come before this group for discussion, in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, those issues may not the subject of formal action during this meeting. Action will be restricted to those issues specifically listed in this notice.

Special Accommodations

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to the Council office (see **ADDRESSES**) by September 20, 1999.

Dated: September 8, 1999.

Bruce C. Morehead,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 99–23799 Filed 9–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 082599B]

Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska Management Area; Exempted Fishing Permit

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Issuance of an exempted fishing permit (EFP).

SUMMARY: NMFS announces the issuance of exempted fishing permit (EFP) 99–04 to the Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation, Inc. (AFDF). The EFP authorizes AFDF to conduct an experiment in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA) to test artificial bait fabricated from Alaska pollock offal. This EFP is necessary to obtain information that could prove valuable for Alaska fisheries. It is intended to further the goals of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the EFP and the Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared for the EFP are available from Lori Gravel, Sustainable Fisheries Division, Alaska Region, NMFS, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nina Mollett, 907–586–7462.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska authorizes the issuance of EFPs for fishing for groundfish in a manner that would otherwise be prohibited under existing regulations. The procedures for issuing EFPs are set out at 50 CFR 679.6 and 600.745.

NMFS received an EFP application from AFDF on April 19, 1999, to conduct field trials in the GOA to test artificial longline bait fabricated from Alaska seafood offal. An announcement of receipt of the EFP application was published in the **Federal Register** on June 8, 1999 (64 FR 30488). The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) approved the application at its June 9–14, 1999, meeting in Kodiak.

AFDF is receiving funding for this project from the Alaska Science Technology Foundation and is conducting its research collaboratively with MARCO Marine; the Center for Applied Regional Studies (based in Cambridge, Massachusetts); and the Wildlife Conservation Society, which is run by the Bronx Zoo in New York City.

AFDF plans to conduct the experiment in the GOA, near Seward, Kodiak, or Sitka, and will charter longline vessels under 60 feet for the purpose. The experiment will consist of two trials: One in late July, consisting of 8 days of fishing, and one in September, consisting of 12 days of fishing. The objective of the experiment is to compare the effectiveness between artificial and natural bait under commercial fishing conditions.

The first trial is intended to determine whether the artificial bait is effective and to make any changes needed in the bait itself or in the procedures followed. The second trial is intended to obtain meaningful and, if possible, statistically significant results on the effectiveness of the bait. The bait will be tested for its attractiveness to Pacific cod, to other species taken as incidental catch in the Pacific cod fishery, and to Pacific halibut.

AFDF sees both environmental and socioeconomic benefits accruing from its experiment, which, if successful, will lead to the substitution of artificial bait for much of the natural bait that is currently used. Potential environmental benefits include:

1. Recycling waste that is currently being dumped into the ocean into a productive use;
2. Reducing fishing pressure on bait species that are also used for human consumption, such as squid and herring;
3. Enhancing fishermen's ability to target species and size of fish desired, thus lowering bycatch and discard rates. Norwegian studies have indicated that bait type may be the most important gear factor affecting species and size selectivity.

Potential socioeconomic benefits include:

1. Creation of Alaskan jobs in producing the artificial bait, and money brought into Alaska through sale of artificial bait, as opposed to natural bait currently bought out of state.
2. Cost savings from bait that is less subject to loss, can continue to attract fish for longer periods underwater, and is more consistent in quality. Frozen bait, bought sight unseen, is sometimes rotten, and natural bait is often lost when it is cut into wrong size pieces;
3. Cheaper bait—AFDF anticipates that its artificial bait will be less expensive by 15 to 20 percent;
4. Higher catch rates if artificial bait proves to be indeed more successful in attracting fish than natural bait; and
5. Improved safety in that uniform sized bait will be less likely to cause problems in automatic bait machines.

AFDF plans to make two to four sets per day, depending on the weather. It will use four strings of longlines per set, each consisting of four skates and 200 hooks. Natural bait (herring) and artificial bait will be fished on each longline, alternating every ten hooks. Hook timers will be used to determine whether fish are attacking the bait and not being hooked and to compare catch over time and the success of hooking rates among bait types. Temperature-depth-time recorders will be used to determine fishing time on the bottom. Underwater video observations will be taken twice daily, for two hours at a time, to observe fish behavior with artificial and natural bait and to interpret the data recorded by the hook timers.

Data collected prior to each set and before recovering gear will include vessel location, time, date, set number, set direction, beginning and ending set time, bottom depth, wind speed, swell height, chop height, presence of birds, and so forth. While hauling in the gear, data collected will include the bait type,