a result of these activities was forwarded to the Commission in SECY–99–007A, ''Recommendations for Reactor Oversight Process Improvements (Follow-Up to SECY–99–007),'' to support final Commission approval of the proposed reactor oversight process. The staff briefed the Commission on SECY–99–007A and its attachments on March 26, 1999.

Scope of the Public Comment Period

The follow-up recommendations for an integrated oversight process are presented in SECY–99–007A,'' Recommendations for Reactor Oversight Process Improvements (Follow-Up to SECY–99-007),'' dated March 22, 1999, and its attachments. This paper includes further development of the Significance Determination Process (SDP) and the revised Enforcement policy.

A separate **Federal Register** notice will be issued to solicit public comment on the proposed enforcement policy. However, respondents are welcome to address any portion of the enforcement policy in this notice. This public comment period will focus on obtaining industry and public views on how the NRC should implement the processes for overseeing and assessing licensee safety performance as refined in SECY–99–007A and discussed in the Commission meeting on March 26, 1999.

The NRC seeks public comment and feedback on the topics discussed in the SECY and its attachments. Respondents are not limited to and are not obligated to provide comments on each attachment. In providing comments, please key your response to the applicable attachment and be as specific as possible. The use of examples is encouraged.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of April 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael R. Johnson,

Acting Chief, Inspection Program Branch Division of Inspection Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–9744 Filed 4–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

POSTAL SERVICE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Sunshine Act Meeting

TIMES AND DATES: 10:00 a.m., Monday, May 3, 1999; 8:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 4, 1999.

PLACE: Garden City, Long Island, New York, at the Garden City Hotel, 45 Seventh Street, in the Society A–C Rooms.

STATUS: May 3 (Closed); May 4 (Open).

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Monday, May 3—10:00 a.m. (Closed).

1. Postal Rate Commission Opinion and Recommended Decision in Docket No. MC99–1, Nonletter-Size Business Reply Mail Experiment.
2. Filing with the Postal Rate Commission for Bulk Parcel Return Service (BPRS).
3. Financial Performance Indicators.
4. Midyear Budget Review.
5. Office of the Inspector General Budget Review.
6. Personnel Matters.

Tuesday, May 4—8:30 a.m. (Open).

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting, March 29–30, 1999.
2. Remarks of the Postmaster General/Chief Executive Officer.
3. Consideration of Semiannual Report to Congress on Summary of Investigative Activities [Actions Under 39 U.S.C. 3005 and 3007].
4. Capital Investments.
   a. Remote Computer Reader 2000.
   b. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, P&DC—Advance Site Acquisition.
5. Quarterly Report on Service Performance.
6. Quarterly Report on Financial Results.
7. Report on the New York Metro Area and Long Island Performance Cluster.
8. Tentative Agenda for the June 7–8, 1999, meeting in Washington, D.C.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Thomas J. Koerber, Secretary of the Board, U.S. Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20260–1000. Telephone (202) 268–4800.

Thomas J. Koerber,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–9849 Filed 4–15–99; 12:23 pm]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–M

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[Declaration of Disaster #3165]

Louisiana; and Contiguous Counties in Arkansas

Bossier Parish and the contiguous Parishes of Bienville, Caddo, Red River, and Webster in the State of Louisiana, and Lafayette and Miller Counties in the State of Arkansas constitute a disaster area as a result of damages caused by severe storms, tornadoes, and flooding which occurred on April 3, 1999. Applications for loans for physical damage as a result of this disaster may be filed until the close of business on June 7, 1999 and for economic injury until the close of business on Jan. 7, 2000 at the address listed below or other locally announced locations:

Small Business Administration, Disaster Area 3 Office, 4400 Amon Carter Blvd., Suite 102, Ft. Worth, TX 76155

The interest rates are:

	Percent
For Physical Damage:	
HOMEOWNERS WITH CREDIT AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE	6.375
HOMEOWNERS WITHOUT CREDIT AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE	3.188
BUSINESSES WITH CREDIT AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE	8.000
BUSINESSES AND NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS WITHOUT CREDIT AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE	4.000
OTHERS (INCLUDING NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS) WITH CREDIT AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE	7.000
For Economic Injury:	
BUSINESSES AND SMALL AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVES WITHOUT CREDIT AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE	4.000

The numbers assigned to this disaster for physical damage are 316511 for Louisiana and 316611 for Arkansas. For economic injury the numbers are 9C1600 for Louisiana and 9C1700 for Arkansas.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 59002 and 59008)

Dated: April 7, 1999.

Aida Alvarez,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 99–9654 Filed 4–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025–01–P

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Region I, Pittsburgh District Office, Pittsburgh, PA; Advisory Council Meeting; Public Meeting

The U.S. Small Business Administration, Pittsburgh District Office, Advisory Council will hold a public meeting from 10:00 a.m., Thursday, April 22, 1999, at the U.S. Small Business Administration District Office, Federal Building—Room 1128, 1000 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15222–4004. The meeting will be held in the conference room, to discuss such matters as may be presented by members, staff of the U.S. Small Business Administration, or others present. One of the key items on the agenda is: Seeking a tax credit in the state of PA for the loan guaranty fees that borrowers must pay.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Write or call, Carrie A. Herron, (412) 395–6560, U.S. Small Business

Administration, 1000 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15222–4004.

Shirl Thomas,

Director, External Affairs.

[FR Doc. 99–9655 Filed 4–16–99:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025–01–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Docket No. 301–100a]

Implementation of WTO Recommendations Concerning the European Communities' Regime for the Importation, Sale and Distribution of Bananas

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice of United States suspension of tariff concessions.

SUMMARY: The United States Trade Representative (USTR) has decided to suspend the application of tariff concessions and to impose a 100% *ad valorem* rate of duty on the articles described in the Annex to this notice that are the products of certain member States of the European Communities (EC) as a result of the EC's failure to implement the recommendations and rulings of the World Trade Organization (WTO) Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) concerning the EC's regime for the importation, sale and distribution of bananas (banana regime). This action constitutes the exercise of U.S. rights under Article 22.6 of the WTO Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU) and is taken pursuant to the authority granted to the USTR under section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The USTR has determined that, effective April 19, 1999, a 100% *ad valorem* rate of duty shall be applied to the articles described in the Annex to this notice that are the products of Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, or the United Kingdom and that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after March 3, 1999. Any merchandise subject to this determination that is admitted to U.S. foreign-trade zones on or after April 19, 1999 must be admitted as ''privileged foreign status'' as defined in 19 CFR 146.41.

ADDRESSES: 600 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sybia Harrison, Staff Assistant to the Section 301 Committee, (202) 395–3419, for questions concerning documents and USTR procedures; William Busis, Associate General Counsel, (202) 395–3150 or Ralph Ives, Deputy Assistant U.S. Trade Representative, (202) 395–3320, for questions concerning WTO developments regarding the banana regime; John Valentine, Acting Director, International Agreements Staff, U.S. Customs Service, (202) 927–1219, for questions concerning classification; and Yvonne Tomenga, Program Officer, Office of Trade Compliance, U.S. Customs Service, (202) 927–0133, for questions concerning entries.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 27, 1995, the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative initiated an investigation pursuant to section 302(b)(1) of the Trade Act with respect to the EC banana regime and, in accordance with section 303(a) of the Trade Act, promptly requested consultations with the EC pursuant to the DSU and relevant provisions of several WTO agreements. [60 FR 52026]. The EC regime was designed, among other things, to take away a major part of the banana distribution business of U.S. companies. Subsequently the United States, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Mexico jointly requested the establishment of a WTO dispute settlement panel to examine the regime. Both the panel and the WTO Appellate Body found the EC banana regime in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT) and the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). On September 25, 1997, the DSB adopted the report of the panel, as modified by the Appellate Body. The resulting DSB recommendations and rulings include, *inter alia,* the recommendation that the EC bring the measures found to be inconsistent with the GATT and the GATS into conformity with its obligations under those agreements. A WTO-appointed arbitrator subsequently determined that the ''reasonable period of time'' for the EC to implement the DSB recommendations and rulings would expire by January 1, 1999.

Based on the results of the WTO dispute settlement proceedings, the USTR on February 10, 1998, determined pursuant to section 304 of the Trade Act that the EC banana regime violates trade agreements. [63 FR 8248]. The USTR further determined that the EC's undertaking to implement all of the recommendations and rulings of the WTO reports by January 1, 1999 constituted for the purposes of section 301(a)(2)(B)(i) the taking of satisfactory measures to grant the rights of the United States under the those trade agreements. Therefore, pursuant to section 301(a)(2), the USTR terminated the investigation without taking action under section 301 of the Trade Act. The USTR stated in the termination notice that it would monitor the EC's implementation of the DSB recommendations and rulings under section 306 of the Trade Act.

On January 1, 1999, modifications to the EC banana regime became effective (EC Regulations 1637/98 and 2362/98), and the EC claimed that these modifications brought its banana regime into conformity with its WTO obligations. However, these regulations perpetuate discriminatory aspects of the EC banana regime that were identified in the DSB's recommendations and rulings as inconsistent with WTO agreements. Therefore, on January 14, 1999, in accordance with U.S. rights under Article 22 of the DSU, the United States requested authorization from the DSB to suspend the application to the EC, and member States thereof, of tariff concessions and related obligations under the GATT covering trade in an amount of US $520 million. [*www.ustr.org,* Press Release 99–01]. On January 29, the EC objected to the level of suspension proposed by the United States and the matter was referred to arbitration pursuant to Article 22.6 of the DSU. Under DSU procedures, the arbitration should have been completed by March 2, 1999. However, on March 2 the arbitrators issued only an initial decision and requested further information from the parties. On March 3, USTR announced that the U.S. Customs Service would begin withholding liquidation and reviewing the sufficiency of bonds on imports of selected European products. The purpose of this announcement was to ensure that, upon issuance of the arbitrators' final decision, the United States would be in the same position to take action as it would have been had the arbitrators issued their decision by the March 2 deadline.

On April 6, the arbitrators issued their final decision determining that the level of nullification or impairment suffered by the United States as a result of the EC's WTO-inconsistent banana regime is $191.4 million per year and that the United States is entitled to suspend the application to the European Communities and its member States of tariff concessions and related obligations under the GATT covering trade up to that amount. A meeting of the DSB was then scheduled for April 19, 1999, at which the DSB, pursuant to Article 22.7 of the DSU, shall grant