

For the Forest Service, this decision may be appealed in accordance with the provisions of 36 CFR 217.7(a) by filing a written notice of appeal with the Secretary of Agriculture, in duplicate, within 45 days of the date of publication of this notice of availability. Review by the Secretary is discretionary. For the Bureau of Land Management, this decision may be appealed to the Department of the Interior, Board of Land Appeals, in accordance with the provisions of 43 CFR 4.20 to 4.31 and 43 CFR 4.400 to 4.415, by filing a written notice of appeal. The notice must be filed with the Director of the Bureau of Land Management within 30 days of the date of publication of this legal notice of availability.

Dated: February 24, 1995.

For the Forest Service:

Jack Ward Thomas,
Chief, USDA Forest Service.

Dated: February 24, 1995.

For the Bureau of Land Management:

Mike Dombeck,
Acting Director, USDI Bureau of Land Management.
[FR Doc. 95-5149 Filed 3-1-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Rocky Mountain Region; AA Production, Inc.; Twin-Creeks-Unit; Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forests; Gunnison County, CO

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Cancellation of a notice of intent.

SUMMARY: On June 2, 1994 a Notice of Intent to prepare an environmental impact statement was published in the **Federal Register** on pages 28510-28512 entitled Forest Service; Rocky Mountain; AA Production, Inc.; Twin-Creeks-Unit; Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forests; Gunnison County Colorado. The environmental impact statement was to examine a proposal by AA Production, Inc. to drill 4 coal bed methane wells and construct a transportation system to these wells near Paonia, Colorado. Upon publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, the environmental analysis and the June 2, 1994 Notice of Intent is cancelled.

The responsible Bureau of Land Management official is Sally Wisley, Area Manager, San Juan Resource Area,

Federal Building, 701 Camino Del Rio, Durango, Colorado 81301.

The responsible Forest Service official is Ray L. Kingston, Paonia District Ranger, Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forests, PO Box 1030, North Rio Grande Avenue, Paonia, Colorado 81428.

Dated: January 9, 1995.

Ray L. Kingston,
District Ranger.
[FR Doc. 95-5095 Filed 3-1-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

California Spotted Owl EIS

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meetings.

SUMMARY: This notice announces several open houses to which the public is invited to participate in information exchange regarding alternatives being considered in the California Spotted Owl Draft Environmental Impact Statement, as they affect the Plumas National Forest area.

MEETING DATES, TIMES, & ADDRESSES

April 3 from 1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Butte County Library Conference Room, 1820 Mitchell Avenue, Oroville, CA

April 4 from 1:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Plumas County Library Conference Room, 445 Jackson Street, Quincy, CA

April 4 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

Portola City Council Chambers, 35 Third Avenue, Portola, CA.

CONTACT PERSON FOR FURTHER

INFORMATION: Lee Anne Schramel Taylor, Plumas National Forest Supervisors Office, 159 Lawrence Street, Quincy, CA 95971 (916) 283-2050

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Forest Service will release a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to amend the Pacific Southwest Regional Guide and Sierran Province Forest Plans with new management direction for the California Spotted Owl. The purpose of this meeting is to exchange information with the public regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the preferred alternative. The meeting will be informally structured. Members of the team that prepared the DEIS will be available to answer questions and discuss the DEIS. Visual media depicting the alternatives and selected

environmental consequences will be displayed.

Mark J. Madrid,
Forest Supervisor.
[FR Doc. 95-5158 Filed 3-1-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

AGRICULTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD

Meeting

AGENCY: Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board) has scheduled its next meeting to take place in Arlington, VA on Tuesday and Wednesday, March 14-15, 1995. The purpose of the meeting is to review the mission and programs of the Board following the request of the Vice President under the National Performance Review, Phase II. These meetings are closed to the public.

DATES: The meeting will be held on March 14-15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at: Crystal Gateway Marriott, 1700 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information regarding the meetings, please contact Lawrence W. Roffee, Executive Director, (202) 272-5434 ext. 14 (voice) and (202) 272-5449 (TTY).

Lawrence W. Roffee,
Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 95-5172 Filed 3-1-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 8150-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-469-805]

Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order: Stainless Steel Bar From Spain

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 2, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Jenkins or Fabian Rivelis, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230;

telephone: (202) 482-1756 or (202) 482-3853, respectively.

Amendment to the Final Determination

We are amending the final determination of sales at less than fair value of stainless steel bar from Spain to reflect the correction of ministerial errors made in the margin calculations in that determination. We are publishing this amendment to the final determination in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Case History and Amendment of the Final Determination

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), on December 28, 1994, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its final determination that stainless steel bar from Spain was being sold at less than fair value (59 FR 66931). Subsequent to the final determination, we received ministerial error allegations by both petitioners and respondents in this investigation.

On January 12, 1995, petitioners made a timely allegation that the Department made ministerial errors in its final determination. First, they alleged that the Department made two incorrect adjustments to the reported difference-in-merchandise (difmer) data for respondent Roldan, S.A. (Roldan). Petitioners alleged that, in order to correct a discrepancy in Roldan's reported variable manufacturing costs for certain U.S. and home market sales, the Department increased the variable cost of manufacture (COM) for difmer purposes by adding to the home market difmer costs reported by Roldan when, in fact, the home market difmer adjustment should have been subtracted.

Furthermore, petitioners argued that the Department should not have made a similar difmer adjustment to Roldan's reported variable COM for U.S. sales because the discrepancy was confined to Roldan's home market variable COM data.

Respondent agreed with petitioner that the Department should have subtracted, rather than added, from its difmer data in order for it to correspond to its COP data. However, respondent argued that the petitioners were incorrect in their assertion that the discrepancy was confined only to Roldan's home market sales data. Consequently, respondent argued that the adjustment should have been made to the difmer data of both U.S. and home market sales.

We agree that this error constitutes a ministerial error as defined by Section

751(f) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), which states that a "ministerial error" is "an error in addition, subtraction or other arithmetic function, clerical error resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other type of unintentional error which the Secretary considers ministerial." We agree that the Department made a mathematical error when adjusting the respondent's difmer information. Furthermore, we agree with the respondent that this adjustment should have been made to its U.S. difmer information as well as its home market difmer information. We made the proper adjustments in our margin calculations and the resulting margin did not change from the margin calculated for the final determination.

Second, petitioners noted that the Department did not calculate margins for several of Roldan's U.S. sales that did not have product matches or constructed value data. Petitioners argued that the Department should have used the highest non-aberrational margin calculated for individual sales to calculate margins for these sales.

Respondent stated that the Department correctly deleted the sales for which there were no product matches from the margin calculation.

We have analyzed the information submitted by Roldan and have concluded that the Department made a "ministerial error" under Section 751(f) of the Act. We inadvertently omitted these sales in our concordance before they could be matched to the appropriate home market products. We have corrected this problem and calculated a margin for the sales in question.

On January 13, 1995, Acenor, S.A. (Acenor), a mandatory respondent that withdrew from the investigation, and Roldan, made timely allegations that the Department made ministerial errors in its final determination. Acenor alleged that its deposit rate was based on data presented in a sales below cost of production (COP) allegation which was determined to be invalid by the Department.

Petitioners argued that because Acenor was no longer an interested party in the investigation, the firm of George V. Egge Jr., P.C. could no longer represent itself as counsel for Acenor and submit a ministerial error allegation on its behalf. Petitioners further suggested that if the Department were to modify the best information available (BIA) rate applied to Acenor, it should have used the highest individual margin calculated in the preliminary determination using Acenor's own data.

We disagree with petitioners that Acenor is no longer an interested party. The fact that Acenor decided to withdraw from further participation does not change the fact that they are a named respondent who participated substantially throughout most of the investigation. We also disagree with respondent that the Department made a ministerial error in calculating its BIA rate. We determine that this issue is methodological and was improperly raised as a ministerial error under Section 751(f) of the Act.

Roldan claimed that over half of its U.S. sales were improperly matched to home market sales made at a different level of trade. Petitioners argued that Roldan's argument is not a ministerial error allegation and should be rejected. We agree with petitioners that this allegation is not ministerial in nature, but rather a methodological question.

On January 19, 1995, petitioners commented on respondent's allegation and on January 20, 1995, respondent commented on petitioners' allegation.

Scope of Order

The product covered by this order is stainless steel bar (SSB). SSB means articles of stainless steel in straight lengths that have been either hot-rolled, forged, turned, cold-drawn, cold-rolled or otherwise cold-finished, or ground, having a uniform solid cross section along their whole length in the shape of circles, segments of circles, ovals, rectangles (including squares), triangles, hexagons, octagons or other convex polygons. SSB includes cold-finished SSBs that are turned or ground in straight lengths, whether produced from hot-rolled bar or from straightened and cut rod or wire, and reinforcing bars that have indentations, ribs, grooves, or other deformations produced during the rolling process.

Except as specified above, the term does not include stainless steel semi-finished products, cut length flat-rolled products (*i.e.*, cut length rolled products which if less than 4.75 mm in thickness have a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness, or if 4.75 mm or more in thickness having a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness), wire (*i.e.*, cold-formed products in coils, of any uniform solid cross section along their whole length, which do not conform to the definition of flat-rolled products), and angles, shapes and sections.

The SSB subject to this order is currently classifiable under subheadings 7222.10.0005, 7222.10.0050, 7222.20.0005, 7222.20.0045, 7222.20.0075, and 7222.30.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the

United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Antidumping Duty Order

In accordance with section 735(a) of the Act, on December 19, 1994, the Department made its final determination that SSB from Spain was being sold at less than fair value (59 FR 66931, December 28, 1994). On February 10, 1995, the International Trade Commission notified the Department of its final determination, pursuant to section 735(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of the subject merchandise.

Therefore, all unliquidated entries of SSB from Spain entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after August 4, 1994, which is the date on which the Department published its notice of preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**, are liable for the assessment of antidumping duties.

In accordance with section 736(a)(1) of the Act, the Department will direct Customs officers to assess, upon further advice by the administering authority, antidumping duties equal to the amount by which the foreign market value of the merchandise exceeds the United States price for all relevant entries of SSB from Spain. Customs officers must require, at the same time as importers would normally deposit estimated duties on this merchandise, a cash deposit equal to the estimated weighted-average antidumping duty margins as noted below. The "All Others" rate applies to all exporters of subject merchandise not specifically listed below.

The *ad valorem* weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/Producer/Exporter	Margin percentage
Acenor, S.A. (and all successor companies, including Digeco, S.A. and Clorimax, SRL)	62.85
Roldan, S.A.	7.72
All Others	25.77

This notice constitutes the antidumping duty order with respect to SSB from Spain pursuant to section 736(a) of the Act. Interested parties may contact the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building, for copies of an updated list of antidumping orders currently in effect.

This order is published in accordance with section 736(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.21.

Dated: February 24, 1995.
Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.
 [FR Doc. 95-5181 Filed 3-1-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Defense Science Board Task Force on Role of Federally Funded Research & Development Centers (FFRDC's) in DoD Mission

ACTION: Notice of advisory committee meeting.

SUMMARY: The Defense Science Board Task Force on Role of Federally Funded Research & Development Centers (FFRDC's) in DoD Mission will meet in open session on March 13, 1995 at the Institute for Defense Analyses, 2001 N. Beauregard Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense.

Persons interested in further information should call Mr. Robert Nemetz at (703) 756-2096.

Dated: February 24, 1995.
L.M. Bynum,
Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.
 [FR Doc. 95-5080 Filed 3-1-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

Defense Science Board Task Force on Combat Identification

ACTION: Notice of Advisory Committee Meetings.

SUMMARY: The Defense Science Board Task Force on Combat Identification will meet in closed session on March 20-21, 1995 at the Pentagon, Arlington, Virginia.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense through the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology) on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. At this meeting the Task Force will evaluate the DoD long term strategy and plan for development and fielding of a comprehensive situational awareness (SA) and combat identification (CID) architecture.

In accordance with section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. 92-463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. II, (1988)), it has been determined that this DSB Task Force meeting, concerns matters listed in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1) (1988), and that accordingly this meeting will be closed to the public.

Dated: February 24, 1995.
L.M. Bynum,
Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.
 [FR Doc. 95-5081 Filed 3-1-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

Department of the Air Force

Record of Decision (ROD) for the Disposal and Reuse of Williams Air Force Base (AFB), AZ

On February 17, 1995, the Air Force signed the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Disposal and Reuse of Williams AFB. The decisions included in this ROD have been made in consideration of, but not limited to, the information contained in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Disposal and Reuse of Williams AFB, filed with the Environmental Protection Agency on June 3, 1994.

Williams AFB closed on September 30, 1993, pursuant to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (DBCRA), (Pub. L. 101-510), and recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. This ROD documents the decisions made by the Air Force on the division of parcels, the method by which parcels are to be conveyed or transferred, and the mitigation measures to be adopted.

The decision in this ROD is to dispose of the aviation-related portion of Williams AFB in a manner that will enable the development of a regional airport with the capacity for expanding commercial and industrial development. This allows for the central theme of the proposed future land use plans discussed in the FEIS to be fully implemented. The Department of Defense (DoD) is retaining 10.74 acres for the U.S. Army Reserves, and 8 acres of the U.S. Air Force for continued military use. Four (4) parcels comprising 249 acres were declared excess to the needs of DoD and are reserved for transfer to other Federal Agencies: 1 acre for the National Weather Service, and 248 acres in perpetual easements for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). In total, approximately 4,023 fee acres are surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. The base has been divided