

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the Denied Persons of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the Denied Persons acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the Denied Persons of any item subject to the EAR that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the Denied Persons order in the United States any item subject to the EAR with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Persons, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Persons if such service involves the use of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

*Third*, that, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in section 766.23 of the EAR, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to any of the Respondents by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

*Fourth*, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the EAR where the only items involved that are subject to the EAR are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

*Fifth*, that in accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(e) of the EAR, the Respondents may, at any time, appeal this Order by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022.

*Sixth*, that in accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(d) of the EAR, BIS may seek renewal of this Order by filing a written request not later than 20 days before the expiration date. The Respondents may oppose a request to renew this Order by filing a

written submission with the Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement, which must be received not later than seven days before the expiration date of the Order.

*Seventh*, that a copy of this Order shall be served on the Respondents and shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

*Eighth*, that this Order is effective upon publication in the **Federal Register** and shall remain in effect for 180 days.

Entered this 8th day of March, 2005.

**Wendy L. Wysong**,

*Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 05-4877 Filed 3-11-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DT-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-351-832]

#### Notice of Extension of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Brazil

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 14, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Constance Handley or David Neubacher, at (202) 482-0631 or (202) 482-5823, respectively; AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

#### Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to issue (1) the preliminary results of a review within 245 days after the last day of the month in which occurs the anniversary of the date of publication of an order or finding for which a review is requested, and (2) the final results within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within that time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary results to a maximum of 365 days and the final results to a maximum of 180 days (or 300 days if the Department does not extend the time limit for the preliminary results) from the date of the publication of the

preliminary results. *See also* 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).

#### Extension of Final Results of Reviews

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the final results of this review within the original time limits. Due to the complexity of issues present in this administrative review, such as the issues of affiliation and adverse facts available, the Department needs more time to address these items and evaluate the issues more thoroughly. The Department also needs more time to address issues raised in the formal scope inquiry that was initiated in conjunction with the administrative review on the exclusion of Grade 1080 Tire Cord Quality Wire Rod and Tire Bead Quality Wire Rod. Therefore, we are extending the deadline for the final results of the above-referenced review by 60 days. This 60-day extension of the final results falls on Saturday, May 7, 2005; therefore, the final results will be issued no later than the first business day thereafter, Monday, May 9, 2005.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).

Dated: March 8, 2005.

**Barbara E. Tillman**,

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E5-1066 Filed 3-11-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

(A-580-816)

#### Notice of Final Results of the Tenth Administrative Review and New Shipper Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Republic of Korea

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

**SUMMARY:** On September 7, 2004, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the antidumping duty administrative review and antidumping duty new shipper review for certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products (CORE) from the Republic of Korea (*Preliminary Results*). This review covers four manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise: Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Union); Pohang Iron & Steel Company, Ltd. (POSCO), Pohang Coated Steel Co., Ltd. (POCOS), and Pohang Steel Industries

Co., Ltd. (PSI) (collectively, POSCO); Dongbu Steel Corporation, Ltd. (Dongbu); and Dongshin Special Steel Co., Ltd. (Dongshin).<sup>1</sup> The period of review (POR) is August 1, 2002, through July 31, 2003. In response to a request from Hyundai Hysco (HYSCO), the Department is also conducting a new shipper review. The POR for the new shipper review is also August 1, 2002, through July 31, 2003.

As a result of our analysis of the comments received, these final results differ from the preliminary results. For our final results, we have found that during the POR POSCO sold subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV). We have also found that Union, Dongbu, and HYSCO did not make sales of the subject merchandise at less than NV (i.e., they have “zero” or de minimis dumping margins). Regarding Dongshin, because it failed to respond to the Department’s questionnaire, we preliminarily determined to resort to adverse facts available and assigned to Dongshin the all others rate in effect for this order (17.70 percent), which is the highest margin upheld in this proceeding. See *Preliminary Results*, 69 FR at 54104. Since the publication of the *Preliminary Results*, we have not received any comments from interested parties that would warrant reconsideration of our finding. Therefore, we have continued to assign a rate of 17.70 percent to Dongshin. The final results are listed in the “Final Results of Review” section below. Furthermore, we rescinded the request for review of the antidumping order for SeAH Steel Corporation (SeAH) because neither SeAH nor its affiliates had exports or sales of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR. For more information, see *Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Korea: Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 69 FR 25059 (May 5, 2004) (*Partial Rescission of CORE*).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 14, 2005.

<sup>1</sup> On May 5, 2004, the Department rescinded the review of SeAH Steel Corporation (SeAH) because neither SeAH nor its affiliates had exports or sales of the subject merchandise to the United States during the POR. See *Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Korea: Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 69 FR 25059 (May 5, 2004). On June 22, 2004, the Department published a correction regarding its rescission of the review of SeAH. See *Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Korea: Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 69 FR 34646, in which the Department addressed a comment from petitioners that it inadvertently failed to address in the March 4, 2004, rescission notice. Upon review of petitioners’ additional comment, the Department determined to continue to rescind the review of SeAH. *Id.* at 34647.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Martin Claessens (Union), Preeti Tolani (Dongbu), Lyman Armstrong (POSCO), and Joy Zhang (HYSCO) at (202) 482–5451, (202) 482–0395, (202) 482–3601, and (202) 482–1168, respectively; AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On September 7, 2004, the Department of Commerce published the *Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review for Certain Corrosion-resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Republic of Korea*, 69 FR 54101 (September 7, 2004). On October 29, 2004, the Department published the notice of extension of final results of the antidumping administrative review of corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Korea, extending the date for these final results to March 7, 2005. See *Corrosion Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Korea: Extension of Time Limits for the Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review and New Shipper Review*, 69 FR 63140.

From November 8 through November 19, 2004, the Department conducted the cost verification of POSCO in Pohang, South Korea, and the sales verification in Seoul, South Korea. The constructed export price (CEP) verification was conducted at POSAM’s headquarters in Fort Lee, New Jersey, on January 13 and 14, 2005. The Department conducted the cost and sales verification of Union in Seoul, South Korea, from November 10 through November 23, 2004, and the CEP verification was conducted at the Torrance, California, facility of Dongkuk International, Inc. on January 25 and 26, 2005. The Department conducted the cost and sales verification of Dongbu in Seoul, South Korea, from January 11 through January 21, 2005, and the CEP verification was conducted at the Torrance, California, facility of Dongbu’s subsidiary, Dongbu USA Incorporated on January 27 and January 28, 2005. From January 10 through January 21, 2005, the Department conducted the sales verification of HYSCO in Seoul, South Korea and the cost verification at HYSCO’s plant in Suncheon, South Korea.

**Comments from Interested Parties**

We invited parties to comment on our *Preliminary Results*. On February 11, 2005, United States Steel Corporation (US Steel) filed case briefs, concerning

POSCO and Union, and International Steel Group (ISG) filed a case brief concerning POSCO, Union, Dongbu, and HYSCO.<sup>2</sup> POSCO and Union, each filed case briefs on February 11, 2005. On February 16, 2005, US Steel and ISG submitted rebuttal briefs concerning POSCO, and Union, Dongbu, and HYSCO also submitted rebuttal briefs. On February 18, 2005, a public hearing was held at the Department with respect to POSCO, Union, Dongbu, and HYSCO.

**Scope of the Order**

This order covers cold-rolled (cold-reduced) carbon steel flat-rolled carbon steel products, of rectangular shape, either clad, plated, or coated with corrosion-resistant metals such as zinc, aluminum, or zinc-, aluminum-, nickel- or iron-based alloys, whether or not corrugated or painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers) and of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, or in straight lengths which, if of a thickness less than 4.75 millimeters, are of a width of 0.5 inch or greater and which measures at least 10 times the thickness or if of a thickness of 4.75 millimeters or more are of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 7210.30.0030, 7210.30.0060, 7210.41.0000, 7210.49.0030, 7210.49.0090, 7210.61.0000, 7210.69.0000, 7210.70.6030, 7210.70.6060, 7210.70.6090, 7210.90.1000, 7210.90.6000, 7210.90.9000, 7212.20.0000, 7212.30.1030, 7212.30.1090, 7212.30.3000, 7212.30.5000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000, 7212.60.0000, 7215.90.1000, 7215.90.3000, 7215.90.5000, 7217.20.1500, 7217.30.1530, 7217.30.1560, 7217.90.1000, 7217.90.5030, 7217.90.5060, 7217.90.5090. Included in this order are corrosion-resistant flat-rolled products of nonrectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (i.e., products which have been “worked after rolling”) for example, products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges. Excluded from this order are flat-rolled steel products either plated or coated with tin, lead, chromium, chromium oxides, both tin and lead (“terne plate”), or both

<sup>2</sup> US Steel and ISG are petitioners in this segment of the proceeding.

chromium and chromium oxides (“tin-free steel”), whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating. Also excluded from this order are clad products in straight lengths of 0.1875 inch or more in composite thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness. Also excluded from this order are certain clad stainless flat-rolled products, which are three-layered corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat-rolled products less than 4.75 millimeters in composite thickness that consist of a carbon steel flat-rolled product clad on both sides with stainless steel in a 20%-60%-20% ratio.

These HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written descriptions remain dispositive.

#### Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal brief by parties to these administrative reviews are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum, which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues which parties have raised, and to which we have responded in the Issues and Decision Memorandum, is attached to this notice as an Appendix. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

#### Final Results of Review

We determine that the following weighted-average margins exist:

Producer/Manufacturer	Weighted-Average Margin
Dongbu .....	0.33 <i>de minimis</i>
Union .....	0.36 <i>de minimis</i>
POSCO .....	2.34
HYSKO .....	0.00
Dongshin .....	17.70%

#### Assessment

The Department will determine, and Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department calculated importer-specific duty assessment rates on the basis of the ratio of the total antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of the examined sales for that importer. Where the assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess duties on all entries of subject

merchandise by that importer. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP within 15 days of publication of these final results.

#### Cash Deposit Requirements

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of CORE from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results, as provided by section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act): (1) for companies covered by this review, the cash deposit rate will be the rate listed above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies other than those covered by this review, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the investigation, but the producer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the subject merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the producer is a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 17.70 percent, the “All Others” rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402 (f) 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 presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent increase in antidumping duties by the amount of antidumping duties reimbursed.

This notice also is the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. 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.

We are issuing and publishing these results and notice in accordance with

sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 7, 2005.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

#### APPENDIX I

##### List of Comments and Issues in the Decision Memorandum

##### General Issues:

*Comment 1:* Whether the Department Should Request Further Information and Change its Model-Match Methodology

*Comment 2:* Whether Expenses Incurred by Parent Companies in Korea for Activities Performed There Should Be Treated as Constructed Export Price (CEP) Selling Expenses

*Comment 3:* Whether POSCO and Dongbu Have Provided Sufficient Evidence to Make a Case for the Department to Allow CEP Offsets

*Comment 4:* Whether the Department Should Modify its Existing Criteria for Adjusting U.S. Prices for Drawback and Restate or Disallow Respondents’ Drawback Adjustments

*Comment 5:* Whether the Department Should Deduct “Safeguard Duties” When Calculating United States Prices

##### Company-Specific Issues:

##### Dongbu

*Comment 1:* Whether the Department Should Exclude Certain Low-priced Home Market Sales from Dongbu’s Database

*Comment 2:* Whether the Department Should Recalculate Dongbu’s Credit Expenses on Home Market Sales Denominated in U.S. Dollars

*Comment 3:* Whether the Department Should Reallocate Dongbu’s Home Market Indirect Selling Expenses on the Basis of Sales

*Comment 4:* Whether the Department Should Recalculate Dongbu’s U.S. Interest Revenue Based on a 365-day Year

*Comment 5:* Whether the Department Should Use Dongbu’s Standard Costs plus POR Variances or Historical Costs Adjusted for Inflation in Order to Calculate the Cost of Production of Merchandise Sold but Not Produced During the POR

##### POSCO

*Comment 6:* Whether the Department Should Exclude POSCO’s “Unusual” U.S. Sale from its Margin Calculation Or, Alternatively, Treat it as Non-prime

*Comment 7:* Whether the Department Should Adjust POSCO’s Reported Duty Drawback

*Comment 8:* Whether the Department Should Recalculate POSCO’s Credit

Expense to Take into Account On-invoice Rebates

*Comment 9:* Whether the Department Should Revise POSCO's General and Administrative Selling (G&A) Expense Ratio

*Comment 10:* Whether the Department Should Revise POSCO's Interest Expense Ratio

*Comment 11:* Whether the Department Should Re-Calculate POSAM's U.S. Indirect Selling Expense (ISE)

*Comment 12:* Whether the Department Should Calculate POSAM's Net Interest Expense and Add it to POSAM's U.S. Indirect Selling Expense

*Comment 13:* Whether Department Should Re-Calculate POSCO's U.S. Credit Expense

*Comment 14:* Ministerial Errors with Respect to POSCO's Overrun Sales and Seconds

*Comment 15:* Whether the Department Should Adjust POSCO's Home Market Interest Revenue

#### Union

*Comment 16:* Whether Union's Scrap Offsets Include Value Added Tax (VAT)

*Comment 17:* Whether Union Reimbursed Dongkuk International, Inc. for Antidumping Duties

*Comment 18:* Ministerial Errors for Union

*Comment 19:* Union's U.S. Indirect Selling Expenses - Commission Sales

*Comment 20:* Union's U.S. Indirect Selling Expenses - Slab and Scrap Revenue

*Comment 21:* Union's Treatment of Bad Debt Expenses

*Comment 22:* Union's Net U.S. Interest Expense

*Comment 23:* Whether to Use Partial Facts Available for Union - Freight Costs

#### HYSCO

*Comment 24:* Whether the Department Should Treat HYSCO's U.S. After-Sale Technical Service as a Direct Selling Expense

*Comment 25:* Whether HYSCO Failed to Report Warehousing Expenses for Its U.S. Sales

*Comment 26:* Whether HYSCO Fails to Report U.S. Commissions

*Comment 27:* Whether HYSCO Misreported its Home Market Indirect Selling Expenses

*Comment 28:* Whether the Department Should Treat Certain HYSCO's Local Sales as U.S. Sales

*Comment 29:* Whether the Department Should Recalculate HYSCO's Costs by Applying Different Production Yields [FR Doc. E5-1065 Filed 3-11-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE: 3510-DS-S**

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### International Trade Administration

##### Export Trade Certificate of Review

**ACTION:** Notice of issuance of an amended Export Trade Certificate of Review application No. 00-1A002.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce issued an Export Trade Certificate of Review (Certificate) to the CONSOL Energy Inc. (Consol) on February 16, 2004. This notice summarizes the conduct for which certification has been granted.

##### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jeffrey C. Anspacher, Director, Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, by telephone at (202) 482-5131 (this is not a toll-free number) or e-mail at [oetca@ita.doc.gov](mailto:oetca@ita.doc.gov).

**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. The regulations implementing title III are found at 15 CFR part 325 (2003). The Office of Export Trading Company Affairs ("OETCA") is issuing this notice pursuant to 15 CFR 325.6(b), which requires the Department of Commerce to publish a summary of a Certificate in the **Federal Register**. Under section 305 (a) of the Act and 15 CFR 325.11(a), any person aggrieved by the Secretary's determination may, within 30 days of the date of this notice, bring an action in any appropriate district court of the United States to set aside the determination on the ground that the determination is erroneous.

*Description of Amended Certificate:* Consol's original Certificate was issued on June 30, 2000 (65 FR 43738, July 14, 2000). Consol's Certificate has been amended as follows:

(1) The following company has been added as a "Member" of the Certificate within the meaning of section 325.2(1) of the Regulations (15 CFR 325.2(1)): X Coal Energy & Resources, Latrobe, PA.

Dated: March 7, 2005.

**Jeffrey C. Anspacher,**

*Director, Export Trading Company Affairs.*

[FR Doc. E5-1064 Filed 3-11-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DR-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 030205B]

##### Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations; Public Hearings

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

**ACTION:** Notice of public hearings.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS will hold 12 public hearings in Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and Florida in March and April 2005 for the purpose of answering questions and receiving public testimony on the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan (ALWTRP) draft environmental impact statement (DEIS).

**DATES:** See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** under the heading "Hearing Dates, Times, and Locations" for the dates and locations of the public hearings.

##### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Diane Borggaard, NMFS, Northeast Region, 978-281-9300 ext. 6503; Barb Zoodsma, NMFS, Southeast Region, 904-321-2806; or Kristy Long, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, 301-713-2322.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On February 25, 2005, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register** announcing the availability of the DEIS for public review and comment. The public comment period on the DEIS is from February 25, 2005 to April 26, 2005. The public has the opportunity to submit comments on the document by any one of the following methods:

(1) NMFS/Northeast Region Website: <http://www.nero.noaa.gov/nero/regs/com>. Follow the instructions on the website for submitting comments.

(2) E-mail: [whaledeis.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:whaledeis.comments@noaa.gov).

(3) Mail: Mary Colligan, Assistant Regional Administrator for Protected Resources, NMFS, Northeast Region, 1 Blackburn Dr., Gloucester, MA 01930, ATTN: ALWTRP DEIS.

(4) Facsimile (fax) to: 978-281-9394, ATTN: ALWTRP DEIS.

(5) Public hearings: submit oral comments at one of the DEIS public hearings.

NMFS has scheduled 12 public hearings on the DEIS. The purpose of