review process, but before a tract is accepted. If the finding is documented, the RD has discretionary authority, after consultation with the Solicitor, to pass those tracts so identified to Phase 2 for further analysis. The RD may eliminate all but the largest of the unusual bids from consideration when applying any bid adequacy rule, may choose not to apply a bid adequacy rule, or may reject the tract's highest qualified bid.

All of these procedures are generally completed within 3 weeks of the bid opening, and the results are announced simultaneously at the end of this period.

Phase 2

The Phase 2 bid adequacy determinations are normally completed sequentially over a period ranging between 21 and 90 days after the sale. The total evaluation period can be extended, if needed, at the RD's discretion (61 FR 34730, July 3, 1996).

Activities designed to resolve bid adequacy assessments are undertaken by analyzing, partitioning, and evaluating tracts in two steps:

—Further mapping and/or analysis is done to review, modify, and finalize viability determinations and tract classifications.

—Tracts identified as being viable must undergo an evaluation to determine if fair market value has been received.

After completing these two steps, a series of rules and procedures are followed.

—Accept newly classified confirmed and wildcat tracts having three or more qualified bids if the third largest such bid is at least 50 percent of the highest qualified bid.

—Accept the highest qualified bid on all tracts determined to be nonviable.

—Determine whether any categorical fair market evaluation technique(s) will be used. If so:

—Evaluate, define, and identify the appropriate threshold measure(s).

—Accept all tracts whose individual measures of bid adequacy satisfy the threshold categorical requirements.

—Conduct a full-scale evaluation, which could include the use of MONTCAR,[7] on all remaining tracts [8] passed to Phase 2 and still awaiting an acceptance or rejection decision.

-Compare the highest qualified bid on each of these remaining tracts to two measures of bid adequacy: the Mean Range of Values (MROV)[9] and the Adjusted Delayed Value (ADV)[10].

-Accept the highest qualified bid for those tracts where such a bid equals or exceeds the tract's ADV.

-Reject the highest qualified bid on drainage and development tracts receiving three or more qualified bids where such a bid is less than one-sixth of the tract's MROV.

-Reject the highest qualified bid on drainage and development tracts receiving one or two qualified bids and on confirmed and wildcat tracts receiving only one qualified bid where the high bid is less than the tract's ADV.

At this stage of the process, the outstanding tracts consist of those having a highest qualified bid that is less than the MROV of the ADV, and are either (a) drainage or development tracts receiving three or more qualified bids with the highest such bid exceeding one-sixth of the tract's MROV, or (b) viable confirmed and wildcat tracts that receive two or more qualified bids.

From these outstanding tracts, MMS selects the following ones:

-Drainage and development tracts having three or more qualified bids with the third largest such bid being at least 25 percent of the highest qualified bid;

-Confirmed and wildcat tracts having two or more qualified bids with the second largest such bid being at least 25 percent of the highest qualified bid.

The MMS then compares the highest qualified bid on each of these selected, outstanding tracts to the tract's Revised Arithmetic Average Measure (RAM).[11] For all these tracts:

-Accept the highest qualified bid where such a bid equals or exceeds the tract's RAM.

-Reject the highest qualified bid where such a bid is less than the tract's RAM.

Finally, the MMS identifies those tracts that were in the ''outstanding'' set above but not selected for comparison to the RAM.

-Reject the high bid on all of these leftover tracts.

Dated: February 4, 1999.

Thomas A. Readinger,

Acting Associate Director for Offshore Minerals Management.

[FR Doc. 99–3228 Filed 2–9–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–M

among companies active in a sale on a set of prospective tracts.

[7] MONTCAR is a probabilistic, cash flow computer simulation model designed to conduct a resource-economic evaluation that results in an estimate of the expected net present value of a tract (or prospect) along with other measures.

[8] These include tracts not accepted by a categorical rule that are classified as drainage and development tracts and those classified as confirmed and wildcat tracts that are viable and received (a) one or two qualified bids, or (b) three or more qualified bids where either the third largest such bid is less than 50 percent of the highest qualified bid or the high bid is in the bottom quartile of all three-or-more-bid confirmed and wildcat tracts for a designated water depth category.

[9] The MROV is a dollar measure of a tract's expected net present private value, given that the tract is leased in the current sale, allowing for exploration and economic risk, and including tax consequences including depletion of the cash bonus.

[10] The ADV is the minimum of the MROV and the Delayed MROV (DMROV). The DMROV is a measure used to determine the size of the high bid needed in the current sale to equalize it with the discounted sum of the bonus and royalties expected in the next sale, less the foregone royalties from the current sale. The bonus for the next sale is computed as the MROV associated with the delay in leasing under the projected economic, engineering, and geological leasing receipts conditions, including drainage. If the high bid exceeds the DMROV, then the leasing receipts from the current sale are expected to be greater than those from the next sale, even in cases where the MROV exceeds the high bid.

[11] The RAM is the arithmetic average of the MROV and all qualified bids on the tract that are equal to at least 25 percent of the high bid.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places; Notification of Pending Nominations

Nominations for the following properties being considered for listing in the National Register were received by the National Park Service before January 30, 1999. Pursuant to section 60.13 of 36 CFR Part 60 written comments concerning the significance of these properties under the National Register criteria for evaluation may be forwarded to the National Register, National Park Service, 1849 C St. NW, NC400, Washington, DC 20240. Written comments should be submitted by February 25, 1999.

Carol D. Shull,

Keeper of the National Register.

ALABAMA

Wilcox County

Dry Forks Plantation, E of AL 41. 5.5 mi. SW of Camden, Coy vicinity, 99000250

Furman Historic District, Roughly along Old Snow Hill Rd., Cty. Rd. 59, Burson Rd., and AL 21, Furman, 99000249

Pine Apple Historic District, Roughly along Old Depot, Cty. Rd. 59, 7 and 61, Broad St. Banana St. AL 10 and Adams Dr., Pine Apple, 99000248

ARKANSAS

Washington County

Johnson Switch Building, 3201 Main St., Johnson, 99000251

FLORIDA

Indian River County

Vero Beach Diesel Power Plant, 1246 19th St., Vero Beach, 99000252

IDAHO

Ada County

Idaho National Guard Armory (Tourtellotte and Hummel Architecture TR) 801 Reserve St., Boise, 99000253

ILLINOIS

Sangamon County

US ARMY Aircraft P–51D–25NA 44–73287, Capital Airport , 0.5 N of Jct. of IL 29 and Veterans Parkway, Springfield, 99000254

INDIANA

Elkhart County

State Street—Division Street Historic District, Roughly both sides of State and Division Sts. between Main and Monroe, Elkhart, 99000255

LOUISIANA

Richland Parish

Trio Plantation House, 312 Trio Rd., Rayville vicinity, 99000257

St. Tammany Parish

Fountainbleau State Park, 67825 US 190, Mandeville vicinity, 99000256

MASSACHUSETTS

Hampden County

Indian Orchard Branch Library, 44 Oak St., Springfield, 99000258

Worcester County

Bradley, J.D.C., House, 60 Sears Rd., Southborough, 99000260

Princeton Center Historic District, Jct. of Hubbardston and Mountain Rds., Princeton, 99000259

MONTANA

Madison County

Union City, Address Restricted, Virginia City vicinity, 99000261

VERMONT

Rutland County

East Clarendon Railroad Station, VT 103 and East Rd., Clarendon, 99000262

[FR Doc. 99–3192 Filed 2–9–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–409]

Certain CD–ROM Controllers, and Products Containing Same-II; Notice of Commission Decision Not to Review an Initial Determination Adding Seven Respondents to the Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination (ID) (Order No. 11) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) in the above-captioned investigation to add Actima Technology Corporation, ASUSTek Computer, Inc., Behavior Tech Computer Corporation, Delta Electronics, Inc., Momitsu Multi Media Technologies, Inc., Pan-International Industrial Corporation, and Ultima Electronics Corporation as respondents.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John A. Wasleff, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–3094.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This investigation was instituted on May 7, 1998, based on a complaint filed by Oak Technology Inc. (Oak). 63 Fed. Reg. 26625. The complaint alleges unlawful activities in violation of section 337 through the unlicensed importation and sale for importation of goods infringing claims 1–5 and 8–10 of U.S. Letters Patent 5,581,715.

On August 6, 1998, Oak filed a motion (Motion No. 409–7) to add the seven respondents listed above. Oak and the existing respondents had entered into a stipulation that the proposed respondents should be added. Counsel for the present respondents also represent the additional respondents. The Commission's Office of Unfair Import Investigations supported Oak's motion. No party petitioned for review of the ID.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1337) and section 210.42(h) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 C.F.R. § 210.42(h)).

Copies of the public version of the ID and all other nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this investigation, including the motion to add the seven respondents, are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810.

General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (http://www.usitc.gov).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 1, 1999.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–3270 Filed 2–9–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 701–TA–383 (Final) and 731–TA–805 (Final)]

Elastic Rubber Tape From India

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Scheduling of the final phase of countervailing duty and antidumping investigations.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of the final phase of antidumping investigation No. 731–TA–805 (Final) under section 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1673d(b)) (the Act) to determine whether an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury, or the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of less-than-fair-value imports from India of elastic rubber tape, provided for in subheading 4008.21.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.[1] Section 207.21(b) of the Commission's rules provides that, where the Department of Commerce has issued a negative preliminary determination, the Commission will not publish a notice of scheduling of the final phase of its investigation unless and until it receives an affirmative final determination from Commerce. Although the Department of Commerce has preliminarily determined that countervailable subsidies are not being provided to producers and exporters of elastic rubber tape from India, for purposes of efficiency the Commission hereby waives rule 207.21(b) and gives notice of the scheduling of the final phase of countervailing duty investigation No. 701–TA–383 (Final) under section 705(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. § 1671d(b)). The Commission is taking this action so that the final phases of the countervailing duty and antidumping investigations may proceed concurrently in the event that Commerce makes an affirmative final countervailing duty determination. If

[1] For purposes of these investigations, Commerce has defined the subject merchandise as vulcanized, non-cellular rubber strips, of either natural or synthetic rubber, 0.006 inch to 0.100 inch (0.15mm to 2.54mm) in thickness, and ⅛ inch to 1⅝ inches (3mm to 42mm) in width. Such product is generally used in swimwear and underwear.