

DOC Case No.	ITC Case No.	Country	Product
A-570-827 .....	A-669	China .....	Cased Pencils.

### Statute and Regulations

Pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act, an antidumping ("AD") or countervailing duty ("CVD") order will be revoked, or the suspended investigation will be terminated, unless revocation or termination would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of (1) dumping or a countervailable subsidy, and (2) material injury to the domestic industry.

The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("*Sunset Regulations*"). Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98:3—*Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("*Sunset Policy Bulletin*").

### Filing Information

As a courtesy, we are making information related to sunset proceedings, including copies of the *Sunset Regulations* and *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department's schedule of sunset reviews, case history information (e.g., previous margins, duty absorption determinations, scope language, import volumes), and service lists, available to the public on the Department's sunset internet website at the following address:

"[http://www.ita.doc.gov/import\\_admin/records/sunset/](http://www.ita.doc.gov/import_admin/records/sunset/)".

All submissions in the sunset review must be filed in accordance with the Department's regulations regarding format, translation, service, and certification of documents. These rules can be found at 19 CFR 351.303 (1998). Also, we suggest that parties check the Department's sunset website for any updates to the service list before filing any submissions. We ask that parties notify the Department in writing of any additions or corrections to the list. We also would appreciate written notification if you no longer represent a party on the service list.

Because deadlines in a sunset review are, in many instances, very short, we urge interested parties to apply for access to proprietary information under

administrative protective order ("APO") immediately following publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation of the sunset review. The Department's regulations on submission of proprietary information and eligibility to receive access to business proprietary information under APO can be found at 19 CFR 351.304-306 (see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Administrative Protective Order Procedures; Procedures for Imposing Sanctions for Violation of a Protective Order*, 63 FR 24391 (May 4, 1998)).

### Information Required From Interested Parties

Domestic interested parties (defined in 19 CFR 351.102 (1999)) wishing to participate in the sunset review must respond not later than 15 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation by filing a notice of intent to participate. The required contents of the notice of intent to participate are set forth in the *Sunset Regulations* at 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(ii). In accordance with the *Sunset Regulations*, if we do not receive a notice of intent to participate from at least one domestic interested party by the 15-day deadline, the Department will automatically revoke the order without further review.

If we receive a notice of intent to participate from a domestic interested party, the *Sunset Regulations* provide that *all parties* wishing to participate in the sunset review must file substantive responses not later than 30 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation. The required contents of a substantive response are set forth in the *Sunset Regulations* at 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3). Note that certain information requirements differ for foreign and domestic parties. Also, note that the Department's information requirements are distinct from the International Trade Commission's information requirements. Please consult the *Sunset Regulations* for information regarding the Department's conduct of sunset reviews.<sup>1</sup> Please consult the

<sup>1</sup> A number of parties commented that these interim-final regulations provided insufficient time for rebuttals to substantive responses to a notice of initiation (*Sunset Regulations*, 19 CFR 351.218(d)(4)). As provided in 19 CFR 351.302(b) (1999), the Department will consider individual requests for extension of that five-day deadline based upon a showing of good cause.

Department's regulations at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998) for definitions of terms and for other general information concerning antidumping and countervailing duty proceedings at the Department.

This notice of initiation is being published in accordance with section 751(c) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(c).

Dated: November 24, 1999.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-31216 Filed 11-30-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-122-506; A-583-505]

### Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews: Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada and From Taiwan

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of expedited sunset review: Oil country tubular goods from Canada.

**SUMMARY:** On May 3, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on oil country tubular goods ("OCTG") from Canada and from Taiwan (64 FR 23596) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of notices of intent to participate and adequate substantive comments filed on behalf of domestic interested parties and inadequate response (in these cases, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct expedited reviews. As a result of these reviews, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Reviews section of this notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Scott E. Smith or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230;

telephone: (202) 482-6397 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 1, 1999.

### Statute and Regulations

These reviews were conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("*Sunset Regulations*") and 19 CFR Part 351 (1998) in general. Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98:3—*Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("*Sunset Policy Bulletin*").

### Scope

The merchandise subject to these antidumping duty orders is OCTG from Canada and from Taiwan. This includes American Petroleum Institute ("API") specification OCTG and all other pipe with the following characteristics except entries which the Department determined through its end use certification procedure were not used in OCTG applications: length of at least 16 feet; outside diameter of standard sizes published in the API or proprietary specifications for OCTG with tolerances of plus 1/8 inch for diameters less than or equal to 8 5/8 inches and plus 1/4 inch for diameters greater than 8 5/8 inches, minimum wall thickness as identified for a given outer diameter as published in the API or proprietary specifications for OCTG; a minimum of 40,000 PSI yield strength and a minimum 60,000 PSI tensile strength; and if with seams, must be electric resistance welded. Furthermore, imports covered by these reviews include OCTG with non-standard size wall thickness greater than the minimum identified for a given outer diameter as published in the API or proprietary specifications for OCTG, with surface scabs or slivers, irregularly cut ends, ID or OD has not been mechanically tested or has failed those tests.<sup>1</sup> The merchandise is currently, classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedules ("HTSUS") item numbers 7304.20, 7305.20, and 7306.20. The HTSUS item numbers are provided for

<sup>1</sup> The Department determined, on April 30, 1991, that seamless mechanical tubing/certain coupling stock meeting criteria are excluded from the scope of the order (see *Notice of Scope Rulings*, 56 FR 19833 (April 30, 1991)).

convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The order on OCTG from Canada covers all manufacturers and exporters of Canadian OCTG, excluding Welded Tube of Canada, Ltd. ("Welded Tube") and Ipsco, Inc. ("Ipsco").<sup>2</sup> The order on OCTG from Taiwan covers all manufacturers and exporters of Taiwanese OCTG.

### History of the Orders

The antidumping duty order on OCTG from Canada was published in the **Federal Register** on June 16, 1986 (51 FR 21782).<sup>3</sup> The Department, in the antidumping duty order, as amended, established deposit rates for the following producers and/or exporters: 13.00 percent for Algoma Steel Corporation, Ltd. ("Algoma"), 33.78 percent for Ipsco, and 3.18 percent for Sonco Steel Tube, Ltd. ("Sonco"). The Department also established a 16.65 percent deposit rate for all other producers and/or exporters.

Since that time, the Department has conducted six administrative reviews.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Welded Tube was excluded from the Department's less than fair value determination (see *Antidumping; Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 51 FR 15029 (April 22, 1986)). In addition, the Department revoked this order with respect to Ipsco (see *Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation in Part of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 61 FR 49733 (September 23, 1996)).

<sup>3</sup> The antidumping duty order was subsequently amended. See *Oil Country Tubular Goods (OCTG) From Canada; Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Amendment to Antidumping Duty Order*, 51 FR 29579 (August 19, 1986) and *Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada; Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order in Accordance With Decision Upon Remand*, 54 FR 41576 (October 10, 1989).

<sup>4</sup> See *Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation in Part of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 61 FR 49733 (September 23, 1996); *Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 35898 (July 12, 1995); *Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada, Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 59 FR 34409 (July 5, 1994); *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada*, 56 FR 41890 (August 23, 1991); *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada*, 56 FR 38408 (August 13, 1991); *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada*, 55 FR 50379 (December 10, 1990); *Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada; Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order in Accordance With Decision Upon Remand*, 54 FR 41576 (October 10, 1989); *Oil Country Tubular Goods (OCTG) From Canada; Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Amendment to Antidumping Duty Order*, 51 FR 29579 (August 19, 1986); *Antidumping Duty Order: Oil Country Tubular Goods (OCTG) From Canada*, 51 FR 21782 (June 16, 1986); and *Antidumping; Oil*

We note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case. The order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise, excluding Welded Tube and Ipsco.

The antidumping duty order on OCTG from Taiwan was published in the **Federal Register** on June 16, 1986 (51 FR 22098). The Department, in the antidumping duty order, established a deposit rate of 26.32 percent for Far East Manufacturing Company ("Far East"). The Department also established a 26.32 percent deposit rate for all other producers and/or exporters. The Department has not conducted any administrative reviews of this order. We note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case. The order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise.

### Background

On May 3, 1999, the Department initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on OCTG from Canada and from Taiwan (64 FR 23596), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received Notices of Intent to Participate on behalf of North Star Steel Ohio ("North Star"), Lone Star Steel Company ("Lone Star"), Maverick Tube Corporation ("Maverick"), U.S. Steel Group ("U.S. Steel"), and USS/Kobe Steel Company ("USS/Kobe") (collectively, the "domestic interested parties") on May 18, 1999, within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations*.<sup>5</sup> The domestic interested parties claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as U.S. manufacturers of OCTG. We received complete substantive responses from the domestic interested parties on June 2, 1999, within the 30-day deadline specified in the *Sunset Regulations* under section 351.218(d)(3)(i).

In its response, Lone Star stated that it participated in the original investigations of OCTG from Canada and from Taiwan. Furthermore, Lone Star and Maverick stated that they had participated in subsequent administrative reviews of the Canadian order. U.S. Steel and USS/Kobe stated that neither has participated before the Department in prior proceedings of the Canadian OCTG order. We did not

*Country Tubular Goods From Canada; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 51 FR 15029 (April 22, 1986).

<sup>5</sup> USS/Kobe only provided a substantive response to the Notice of Initiation of the sunset review of OCTG from Canada. USS/Kobe did not participate in the Department's sunset review of OCTG from Taiwan.

receive a substantive response from any respondent interested party to these proceedings. As a result, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C), the Department determined to conduct expedited, 120-day, reviews of these orders.

In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, the Department may treat a review as extraordinarily complicated if it is a review of a transition order (*i.e.*, an order in effect on January 1, 1995). Therefore, on August 31, 1999, the Department extended the time limit for completion of the final results of these reviews until not later than November 29, 1999, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.<sup>6</sup>

#### Determination

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted these reviews to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Section 752(c) of the Act provides that, in making these determinations, the Department shall consider the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigations and subsequent reviews and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and the period after the issuance of the antidumping duty orders, and shall provide to the International Trade Commission ("the Commission") the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the orders are revoked.

The Department's determinations concerning continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are discussed below. In addition, the domestic interested parties' comments with respect to continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are addressed within the respective sections below.

#### Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Drawing on the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"), specifically the Statement of Administrative Action ("the SAA"), H.R. Doc. No. 103-316, vol. 1 (1994), the House Report, H.R. Rep. No. 103-826, pt.1 (1994), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994), the Department issued its *Sunset Policy Bulletin* providing guidance on methodological and analytical issues, including the bases for likelihood

determinations. In its *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department indicated that determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide basis (*see* section II.A.2). In addition, the Department indicated that normally it will determine that revocation of an antidumping order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where (a) Dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, (b) Imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order, or (c) Dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly (*see* section II.A.3).

In addition to considering the guidance on likelihood cited above, section 751(c)(4)(B) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine that revocation of an order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where a respondent interested party waives its participation in the sunset review. In the instant reviews, the Department did not receive a response from any respondent interested party. Pursuant to section 351.218(d)(2)(iii) of the *Sunset Regulations*, this constitutes a waiver of participation.

In their substantive responses, the domestic interested parties argued that revocation of this antidumping duty orders would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping by Canadian and Taiwanese producers and/or exporters of the subject merchandise. With respect to whether dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the orders, the domestic interested parties argued that dumping has continued throughout the life of the orders at above *de minimis* levels. Furthermore, USS/Kobe argued that the dumping margins for some Canadian producers and/or exporters have not only continued throughout the life of the order, but have consistently increased.

The domestic interested parties also argued that import volumes have declined significantly since the issuance of the orders. Specifically, the domestic interested parties argued that imports of OCTG from Canada in the year prior to the imposition of the order amounted to over 150,000 tons but have since almost completely ceased. Specifically, North Star stated that imports of OCTG from Canada have dropped to less than 1,500 tons per year. Furthermore, USS/Kobe provided data which indicates that imports of OCTG from Canada in 1998 were less than 2,000 tons and have not exceeded 8,100 tons in any year since 1991.

With respect to the Taiwanese order, Lone Star and Maverick argued that imports of OCTG from Taiwan were nearly 10,000 tons prior to the imposition of the order but have since almost completely disappeared. In fact, Lone Star and Maverick stated that there were no shipments of the subject merchandise from Taiwan in 1998.

In summary, the domestic interested parties argued that the Department should determine that there is a likelihood that dumping would continue were the orders revoked because (1) Dumping margins above *de minimis* levels have been in place since the imposition of the orders and (2) Imports of the subject merchandise have declined significantly since the imposition of the orders.

As discussed in section II.A.3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the SAA at 890, and the House Report at 63-64, if companies continue dumping with the discipline of an order in place, the Department may reasonably infer that dumping would continue if the discipline were removed. Dumping margins above *de minimis* levels have continued to exist for shipments of the subject merchandise throughout the life of the orders.

Consistent with section 752(c) of the Act, the Department also considered the volume of imports before and after issuance of the orders. The Department, utilizing U.S. Census Bureau IM146 reports, agrees with the domestic interested parties that imports of the subject merchandise decreased sharply following the imposition of the orders. Furthermore, the Department agrees with Lone Star and Maverick that there were no imports to the United States of Taiwanese OCTG in 1998. However, imports of Taiwanese OCTG did resume in 1999. Despite the dramatic decline in imports of OCTG from Canada and Taiwan and the cessation of imports of Taiwanese OCTG in 1998, the Department can confirm that imports of the subject merchandise continue from both countries.

Based on our analysis of the records in these proceedings, the Department finds that the existence of dumping margins after the issuance of the orders is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping. Deposit rates above *de minimis* levels continue in effect for exports of OCTG by all Canadian and Taiwanese manufacturers and/or exporters subject to the orders.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, given that

<sup>6</sup> See *Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Five-Year Reviews*, 64 FR 48579 (September 7, 1999).

<sup>7</sup> As noted above, with respect to the Canadian order, Welded Tube was excluded from the Department's less than fair value determination and the order was revoked with respect to Ipsco (*see*

dumping has continued over the life of the orders and respondent interested parties have waived their right to participate in these reviews before the Department, and absent argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue if the orders were revoked.

### Magnitude of the Margin

In the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department stated that it will normally provide to the Commission the margin that was determined in the final determination in the original investigation. Further, for companies not specifically investigated or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the "all others" rate from the investigation. (See section II.B.1 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*.) Exceptions to this policy include the use of a more recently calculated margin, where appropriate, and consideration of duty absorption determinations. (See sections II.B.2 and 3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*.)

The Department, in the antidumping duty order on OCTG from Canada, as amended, established deposit rates for the following producers and/or exporters: 13.00 percent for Algoma, 33.78 percent for Ipsco, and 3.18 percent for Sonco. The Department also established a 16.65 percent deposit rate for all other producers and/or exporters (51 FR 21782 (June 16, 1986)).<sup>8</sup> We note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case.

The Department, in the antidumping duty order on OCTG from Taiwan, established a deposit rate of 26.32 percent for Far East. The Department also established a 26.32 percent deposit rate for all other producers and/or exporters (51 FR 22098 (June 16, 1986)). We note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case.

*Antidumping; Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 51 FR 15029 (April 22, 1986) and *Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation in Part of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 61 FR 49733 (September 23, 1996).

<sup>8</sup> The antidumping duty order was subsequently amended. See *Oil Country Tubular Goods (OCTG) From Canada: Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Amendment to Antidumping Duty Order*, 51 FR 29579 (August 19, 1986) and *Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada; Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order in Accordance With Decision Upon Remand*, 54 FR 41576 (October 10, 1989).

In its substantive responses, the domestic interested parties argued that the Department should report to the Commission the deposit rates established in the original investigations of these orders because, as stated in the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, they are the only calculated rates that reflect the behavior of producers and/or exporters without the discipline of the order. Furthermore, with respect to the order on OCTG from Canada, USS/Kobe argued that for two additional producers not examined in the original investigation, Christianson Pipe, Ltd. and Prudential Steel, Ltd., the Department should report the all others rate from the original investigation.

The Department agrees with the domestic interested parties. We find that the dumping margins calculated in the original investigations are the only calculated rates that reflect the behavior of exporters without the discipline of the orders. Consistent with the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, we determine that the margins calculated in the Department's original investigations are probative of the behavior of Canadian and Taiwanese producers and/or exporters of OCTG if the orders were revoked. Therefore, we will report to the Commission the company-specific and "all others" rates from the original investigations contained in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

### Final Results of Reviews

As a result of these reviews, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the margins listed below:

	Margin (percent)
Canadian manufacturers/exporters:	
Algoma .....	13.00
Sonco .....	3.18
Ipsco .....	Revoked.
Welded Tube .....	Excluded.
All Others .....	16.65
Taiwanese manufacturers/exporters:	
Far East .....	26.32
All Others .....	26.32

This notice serves as the only 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 351.305 of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of 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 five-year ("sunset") review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: November 24, 1999.

**Joseph A. Spetrini**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-31225 Filed 11-30-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 112299A]

### Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; Public Meetings

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

**ACTION:** Notice of public meetings.

**SUMMARY:** The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council will convene public meetings of the Dolphin and Wahoo Advisory Panel (AP) and Scientific and Statistical Committees (SSC).

**DATES:** The AP meetings will be held January 5, 2000, and the SSC meeting will be held January 12, 2000. See SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION for specific dates and times.

**ADDRESSES:** The meetings will be held in Kenner and New Orleans, Louisiana. See SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION for specific locations.

*Council address:* Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 3018 U.S. Highway 301 North, Suite 1000, Tampa, Florida, 33619.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Richard Leard, Senior Fishery Biologist, Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 3018 U.S. Highway 301 North, Suite 1000, Tampa, Florida, 33619; telephone 813-228-2815.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Meeting Dates and Agendas

The AP meeting is scheduled to begin at 8:30 a.m. on January 5, 2000, and will conclude by 4:00 p.m. The AP meeting will be held at the at the New Orleans Airport Hilton Hotel, 901 Airline Highway, Kenner, Louisiana; telephone 504-469-5000. The Dolphin Wahoo AP will convene to review a "Draft Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin, Coryphaena hippurus, and Wahoo, Acanthocybium solandri, Fishery in the