*Comments:* None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) high neutral beam current (3 to 5A), (2) low beam divergence (0.8 degree) and (3) duration of 3 ms for fluctuation and confinement studies with plasma. These capabilities are pertinent to the applicant's intended purposes and we know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

**Frank W. Creel,**

*Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.*

[FR Doc. 99–21842 Filed 8–20–99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

### University of Southern California; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC.

*Docket Number:* 99–015. *Applicant:* University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089–1340. *Instrument:* Automated Microscope Workstation, Series 200. *Manufacturer:* Singer Instruments, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 64 FR 35630, July 1, 1999.

*Comments:* None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides a stage-mounted micromanipulator and a manually driven detenting stage designed specifically for genetic experiments in yeast cells. The National Institutes of Health advises in its memorandum of July 14, 1999 that (1) this capability is pertinent to the applicant's intended purpose and (2) it knows of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument for the applicant's intended use.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

**Frank W. Creel,**

*Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.*

[FR Doc. 99–21843 Filed 8–20–99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

### Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Proposed MFS Globenet, Inc. Monterey Bay Fiber Optic Cable Installation Project Within the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS)

**AGENCY:** Marine Sanctuaries Division (MSD), Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), National Ocean Service (NOS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce (DOC).

**ACTION:** Notice of intent; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** NOAA announces its intention to prepare an EIS in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 for the authorization of the proposed installation of a fiber optic cable through Monterey Bay, California within the MBNMS. The action to be evaluated by this EIS is the proposal to install a submarine fiber optic telecommunications cable from New Zealand to Hawaii to California, with a focus on that part of the ocean route within the boundaries of the MBNMS and the terrestrial route within Santa Cruz and Monterey counties.

The EIS will be prepared in cooperation with the County of Santa Cruz, which issued a Notice of Preparation on March 29, 1999, regarding its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The EIS prepared under this notice will be combined with the EIR and a joint EIR/EIS will be published.

**DATES:** Written comments on the intent to prepare an EIS and the scope of the EIS will be accepted on or before September 22, 1999. A public scoping meeting to inform interested parties of the proposed action and to receive public comments on the scope of the EIS is scheduled as follows:

September 1, 1999, 7:00–9:00 p.m.

Moss Landing Chamber of Commerce, 8045 Moss Landing Road, Moss Landing, California

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments on the scope of the EIS, suggested alternatives and potential impacts should be sent to William Douros, Responsible Program Manager, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, 299 Foam Street, Monterey, California 93940. Comments may be submitted by FAX at (831) 647–4250. Comments received will be available for public inspection at the above address.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William Douros, Responsible Program Manager, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, 299 Foam Street, Monterey, California 93940.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### I. Proposed Action

The proposed action would involve the authorization of installation of approximately 58.5 miles of submarine cable within the boundaries of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary as part of a larger project for a cable that would link New Zealand to Hawaii and the continental United States. Sanctuary regulations at 15 CFR Part 922, Subpart M, require authorization by the Sanctuary for installation and continued operation of the proposed cable within the MBNMS. The applicant (MFS Globenet, Inc. and Worldcom Network Services, Inc.) anticipates the cable would operate for a minimum of 25 years. The scope of the EIS will address the offshore area from shore to the seaward boundary of the MBNMS.

The seaward component of the project includes the seaward portions of two directionally bored conduits (approximately 950 meters out to sea to a water depth of 15 meters) and one two-inch wide submarine cable extending westward from one of the conduits to deep ocean. The offshore cable would extend along the submarine ridge (''Smooth Ridge'') to the western boundary of the MBNMS (and then onward to New Zealand via Hawaii).

The applicant proposes to bury the cable to a depth of one meter out to a water depth of 2,000 meters, where feasible and where sensitive areas are not prohibitive. In general, the cable would be laid directly onto the ocean floor at ocean depths greater than 2,000 meters, where the potential for conflict with other marine uses is likely to be minimal.

Two cable burial methods are proposed. Where feasible, an underwater plow deployed from the cable ship would cut a narrow trench