based upon information submitted by the respondent Eletrosilex.

With respect to petitioners' argument that the Department should request additional information from Dow due to discrepancies in the amounts reported by Dow and Eletrosilex for depreciation expenses, we disagree. The information submitted by Dow is not relevant to the Department's analysis. First, the data submitted by Dow were illustrative, in that the company was making the point that its independent auditors concluded that Eletrosilex was selling its products above the cost of production. Dow did not provide this information to the Department as a substitute for the information reported by Eletrosilex. Dow stipulated that its cost data were gathered for a completely different purpose, notably to determine whether the financial position of Eletrosilex was sufficiently sound for Dow to establish a long-term supply agreement. Second, this information would only serve to confuse the issue. Dow's auditors utilized a different period in their calculations than the Department, and calculated depreciation in U.S. dollars, while the Department calculated depreciation in Brazilian currency. Finally, this information is clearly unnecessary. The Department requested and received information on this issue in the original and supplemental questionnaire responses by Eletrosilex.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our analysis of the comments received, we determine that the following margins exist for the period March 1, 1995 through February 29, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Percent margin
CBCC	0.00
Eletrosilex	39.00
Minasligas	1.67
Rima	3.08

The Department shall determine, and the 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 during the POR to the total quantity of sales examined during the POR. This method has been upheld by the courts. (*See e.g., Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Singapore, and the United Kingdom; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews,* 61 FR 2081, 2083 (January 15, 1997); FAG Kugelfischer Georg Schafer KgaAv. *United States, No. 92–07–00487,* 1995 Ct. Int'l Trade LEXIS 209, at CIT*10 (September 14, 1995), aff'd. No. 96–1074 1996 U.S. App. Lexis 11544 (Fed. Cir. May 1996).

The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service. Individual differences between United States price and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results of review for all shipments of silicon metal from Brazil entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act, and will remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be those rates listed above except for CBCC, which had a *de minimis* margin, and whose cash deposit rate is therefore zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, 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 prior 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) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review or in the LTFV investigation conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 91.06 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. Sec. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: February 4, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–3488 Filed 2–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

ACTION: Notice of Application to Amend Certificate.

SUMMARY: The Office of Export Trading Company Affairs (''OETCA''), International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, has received an application to amend an Export Trade Certificate of Review. This notice summarizes the proposed amendment and requests comments relevant to whether the amended Certificate should be issued.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Morton Schnabel, Acting Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, (202) 482–5131. This is not a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (15 U.S.C. 4001–21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue Export Trade Certificates of Review. A Certificate of Review protects the holder and the members identified in the Certificate from state and federal government antitrust actions and from private, treble damage antitrust actions for the export conduct specified in the Certificate and carried out in compliance with its terms and conditions. Section 302(b)(1) of the Act and 15 CFR 325.6(a) require the Secretary to publish a notice in the **Federal Register** identifying the applicant and summarizing its proposed export conduct.

Request for Public Comments

Interested parties may submit written comments relevant to the determination whether an amended Certificate should be issued. If the comments include any privileged or confidential business information, it must be clearly marked and a nonconfidential version of the comments (identified as such) should be included. Any comments not marked

privileged or confidential business information will be deemed to be nonconfidential. An original and five copies, plus two copies of the nonconfidential version, should be submitted no later than 20 days after the date of this notice to: Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, Room 1800H, Washington, D.C. 20230. Information submitted by any person is exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). However, nonconfidential versions of the comments will be made available to the applicant if necessary for determining whether or not to issue the Certificate. Comments should refer to this application as ''Export Trade Certificate of Review, application number 94–2A007.''

Florida Citrus Exports, L.C. (''FCE'') original Certificate was issued on February 23, 1995 (60 FR 12735, March 8, 1995) and previously amended on January 16, 1996 (61 FR 4255, February 5, 1996). A summary of the application for an amendment follows.

Summary of the Application

Applicant: Florida Citrus Exports, L.C., 1991 74th Avenue, Vero Beach, Florida 32966.

Contact: Charles M. Sanders, Jr., Attorney, Telephone: (561) 770–4685.

Application No.: 94–2A007.

Date Deemed Submitted: February 4, 1998.

Proposed Amendment: FCE seeks to amend its Certificate to:

1. Add the following companies as new ''Members'' of the Certificate within the meaning of section 325.2(1) of the Regulations (15 C.F.R. 325.2(1)): Dole Citrus, Vero Beach, FL (controlling entity: Dole Food Company, Inc., Westlake Village, CA); Hogan & Sons, Inc., Vero Beach, FL; and The Packers of Indian River, Ltd., Ft. Pierce, FL.

2. Delete Ocean Spray Cranberries Inc., Vero Beach, FL as a ''Member'' of the Certificate.

Dated: February 6, 1998.

Morton Schnabel,

Acting Director Office of Export Trading Company Affairs.

[FR Doc. 98–3423 Filed 2–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 020498A]

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; Meetings

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

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Comprehensive Management Committee will hold a public meeting.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Friday, February 27, 1998, from 10:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Westin Suites Philadelphia Airport, 4101 Island Avenue, Philadelphia, PA; telephone: 215–365–6600.

Council Address: Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 300 S. New Street, Dover, DE 19904; telephone: 302–674–2331.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David R. Keifer, Executive Director, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; telephone: 302–674–2331.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Agenda items are vessel replacement criteria and comprehensive management matrix development.

Although other issues not contained in this agenda may come before this Committee 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. Committee action will be restricted to those issues specifically identified in the agenda 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 Joanna Davis at the Council (see **ADDRESSES**) at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Dated: February 4, 1998.

Bruce C. Morehead,

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

[FR Doc. 98–3463 Filed 2–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Preparation of a Draft Theater Missile Defense Extended Test Range Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; Eglin Gulf Test Range

AGENCY: DOD, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO).

ACTION: Notice of availability (NOA).

SUMMARY: This notifies the public that BMDO is issuing a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for the Eglin Gulf Test Range (EGTR). The DSEIS assesses the potential impacts associated with developmental and operational flight testing of Theater Missile Defense (TMD) systems. The proposed action and alternatives would allow for the development and testing of TMD systems to protect U.S. forces, friends, and allies around the world from attacks by ballistic missiles. As the Executing Agent, the Air Force Development Test Center (AFDTC), Eglin Air Force Base (AFB), Florida, is managing the DSEIS for BMDO. The U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command (USASMDC), Huntsville, Alabama, is preparing the DSEIS documentation for the AFDTC. The DSEIS analyzes additional missile launch and support locations, facility construction, launch preparation activities, missile flight tests, radar and optical tracking operations, and intercept tests in the Gulf of Mexico not analyzed in the *TMD Extended Test Range Final Environmental Impact Statement,* November 1994.

The Record of Decision on the *TMD Extended Test Range Final Environmental Impact Statement,* March 21, 1995, documented only the selection of U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, republic of the Marshall Islands, and the White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, for TMD tests. However, additional interceptor and target missile launch options have been identified for the EGTR. These additional alternatives are within treaty and technology limitations. The EGTR alternatives would provide greater flexibility in test scenarios than is possible if testing remains limited to existing ranges, and would permit more realistic testing of TMD interceptor systems. Copies of the *TMD Extended test Range Final Environmental Impact Statement,* are available at various locations within the interested communities. The exact locations can be provided by contacting the point of contact listed below.

The purpose of expanding the EGTR's missile defense testing capability is to