

determine that there is not a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of disposable pocket lighters from these three companies. In addition, with respect to Cli-Claque, and all non-responding producers/exporters of disposable pocket lighters from the PRC, we preliminarily determine, as best information available, that critical circumstances exist.

We will make a final determination concerning critical circumstances when we make our final determination of sales at less than fair value in this investigation.

This determination is published pursuant to section 733(f) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.15(a)(4).

Dated: December 23, 1994.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-161 Filed 1-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-821-807]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of the Final Determination: Ferrovandium and Nitrided Vanadium from the Russian Federation

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 4, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David J. Goldberger or Louis Apple, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4136 or (202) 482-1769, respectively.

Preliminary Determination:

We preliminarily determine that imports of ferrovandium and nitrided vanadium from the Russian Federation (Russia) are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 733 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). The estimated margins are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

Since initiation of the investigation on June 20, 1994 (59 FR 32952, June 27, 1994), the following events have occurred.

On July 15, 1994, the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) notified the Department of Commerce (the Department) of its preliminary determination that there was a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured, or threatened with material injury, by reason of imports of ferrovandium and nitrided vanadium from Russia.

On July 29, 1994, the Russian Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations (MINFER) advised us that the only producers of the subject merchandise are SC Vanadium Tulachermet (Tulachermet) and Chusavoy Metallurgical Works (Chusavoy).

On August 10, 1994, we sent the antidumping questionnaire to the Embassy of the Russian Federation, as well as to Tulachermet and Chusavoy. (The antidumping questionnaire was divided into three sections: section A requesting general information on each company; section C requesting information on, and a listing of, U.S. sales made during the period of investigation (POI); and, section D requesting information on the production process, including specific amounts of each input used in manufacturing ferrovandium and nitrided vanadium). We requested the Embassy's assistance in forwarding the questionnaire to all Russian exporters and producers of ferrovandium and nitrided vanadium and submitting complete questionnaire responses on their behalf.

In September, we received responses to Section A of the questionnaire from Tulachermet, Chusavoy, and Odermet Limited (Odermet), an exporter of the subject merchandise headquartered in the United Kingdom. Based on information in these responses, as well as additional information submitted by the petitioner, we issued the antidumping questionnaire (limited to Sections A and C) during September, October, and November to trading companies operating in various European countries and the Russian Federation, which may have exported the subject merchandise to the United States during the POI.

In response to these questionnaires, Gesellschaft fhr Elektrometallurgie m.b.H. (GfE) (a German subsidiary of Metallurg, Inc. and related party to Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation (Shieldalloy)), submitted a Section A response in October 1994. Five trading companies—AIOC, Axel Johnson AB (which is related to AIOC), VVO Tiajpromexport, VO Promsyrimport, and Technoinvest—indicated that they did not sell the subject merchandise

during the POI. Three companies did not respond to the questionnaire: Marc Rich Co., AG, Wogan Resources, Ltd., and one Russian trading company that cannot be named in this notice because its identity is deemed business proprietary information.

Two other questionnaires sent to Russian trading companies were returned to us as undeliverable. Finally, we received an unsolicited Section A response from Galt Alloys, Inc. (Galt), an exporter of the subject merchandise, in November 1994.

On September 28, 1994, the Department postponed its preliminary determination until December 27, 1994 (59 FR 50559, October 4, 1994).

In October and November, 1994, the Department received responses to questionnaire section C from Galt, GfE, Odermet, and Tulachermet, and to questionnaire section D from Chusavoy and Tulachermet. In addition, Odermet claimed that it should be considered a reseller of ferrovandium under section 773(f) of the Act, and that its foreign market value should be determined on the basis of its sales to Germany, the intermediate country in which the subject merchandise was sold. Accordingly, Odermet also submitted a questionnaire response for its sales to Germany.

During October and November 1994, the Department requested clarifications of the submitted responses from Chusavoy, Galt, GfE, Odermet, and Tulachermet. In addition, the Department presented to GfE section E-2 of the antidumping questionnaire, regarding information on further manufacturing performed in the United States, because GfE reported that all of its sales in the U.S. were further manufactured by its related affiliate, Shieldalloy, prior to sale to unrelated parties in the United States. Responses to these supplemental information requests were received during November and December. Additional information concerning GfE's Section E-2 was requested and received in December 1994.

In November 1994, the Department provided interested parties with the opportunity to submit publicly-available, published information for the Department to consider when valuing the factor inputs (see "Foreign Market Value" section below). Responses to this request were submitted during December 1994.

On December 19, 1994, the Department received a letter from Marc Rich Co. A.G., (now known as Glencore International A.G. (Glencore)) requesting that the Department provide it with a second questionnaire and

analyze its sales for this proceeding. The Department rejected Glencore's request as untimely on December 27, 1994.

On December 20, 1994, Tulachermet requested that it be granted a separate rate in this determination. This request is discussed below under "Suspension of Liquidation".

Postponement of Final Determination

Pursuant to section 735(a)(2)(A) of the Act, on December 19, 1994, Galt, Tulachermet, and Odermet, exporters accounting for a significant portion of the merchandise in this proceeding, requested that, in the event of an affirmative preliminary determination in this investigation, the Department postpone the final determination to 135 days after the date of publication of the affirmative preliminary determination. The Department finds no compelling reason to deny these requests and is, accordingly, postponing the final determination until the 135th day after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.20 (b).

Scope of Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are ferrovandium and nitrided vanadium, regardless of grade, chemistry, form or size, unless expressly excluded from the scope of this investigation. Ferrovandium includes alloys containing ferrovandium as the predominant element by weight (*i.e.*, more weight than any other element, except iron in some instances) and at least 4 percent by weight of iron. Nitrided vanadium includes compounds containing vanadium as the predominant element, by weight, and at least 5 percent, by weight, of nitrogen. Excluded from the scope of this investigation are the vanadium additives other than ferrovandium and nitrided vanadium, such as vanadium-aluminum master alloys, vanadium chemicals, vanadium waste and scrap, vanadium-bearing raw materials, such as slag, boiler residues and fly ash, and vanadium oxides.

The products subject to these investigations are currently classifiable under subheadings 7202.92.00, 7202.99.5040, 8112.40.3000, and 8112.40.6000 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope is dispositive.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation (POI) in this proceeding is December 1, 1993, through May 31, 1994.

Nonmarket Economy Country Status

Pursuant to section 773(c) of the Act, Russia has been treated as a nonmarket economy country (NME), for the purposes of determining foreign market value, in all past antidumping investigations (*see, e.g., Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Pure Magnesium and Alloy Magnesium from the Russian Federation*, 59 FR 55427 (November 7, 1994) (*Magnesium from Russia*)). No information has been provided in this proceeding that would lead us to change this designation. Therefore, in accordance with section 771(18)(c) of the Act, we have treated Russia as an NME for purposes of this investigation.

Surrogate Country

In accordance with section 773(c)(4) of the Act, we must, to the extent possible, value the factors of production in one or more market economy countries that (1) are at a level of economic development comparable to that of the NME economy country, and (2) are significant producers of comparable merchandise. Initially, the Department identified five countries as possible surrogates: Algeria, Poland, Thailand, Turkey and Tunisia (*see* July 29, 1994, Memorandum from the Office of Policy to Gary Taverman). We subsequently determined, after a further review of economic and production data, that South Africa is also at a level of economic development comparable to Russia. Therefore, given its economic comparability to Russia, and the fact that it is a significant producer of merchandise identical to that being investigated, (*see* December 22, 1994, Memorandum from Office of Policy to Gary Taverman), we have based FMV on the appropriate factors of production as valued in South Africa, except for those factors for which we were unable to obtain a suitable value from South Africa. We have obtained and relied upon published, publicly-available information, wherever possible. For a few factors, we were unable to find appropriate South African values. In these instances, as discussed below in the "FMV" section of this notice, we used values from publicly-available, published information pertaining to Turkey, or values pertaining to Brazil and Germany as included in the petition.

Fair Value Comparisons

A. Participating Respondents

To determine whether sales to the United States of ferrovandium and nitrided vanadium by Galt, GfE, Odermet and Tulachermet, were made

at less than fair value, we compared the United States price (USP) to the foreign market value (FMV), as specified in the "United States Price" and "Foreign Market Value" sections of this notice.

B. Non-participating Respondents

All exporters to which a questionnaire was issued are considered mandatory respondents in this proceeding. We consider those mandatory respondents that did not respond to the questionnaire to be uncooperative respondents, and we have based the less-than-fair-value margin for those companies on the best information available (BIA) in accordance with section 776(c) of the Act. For this preliminary determination, we consider Marc Rich Co. and Wogan Resources to be uncooperative respondents because they did not provide timely responses to our questionnaire. Accordingly, we have based these companies' LTFV margins on an uncooperative BIA rate.

In determining what to use as BIA, the Department follows a two-tiered methodology, whereby the Department normally assigns lower margins to those respondents that cooperated in an investigation and margins based on more adverse assumptions for those respondents which did not cooperate in an investigation. As outlined in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Belgium*, 58 FR 37083 (July 9, 1993), when a company refuses to provide the information requested in the form required, or otherwise significantly impedes the Department's investigation, it is appropriate for the Department to assign to that company the higher of (a) the highest margin alleged in the petition, or (b) the highest calculated rate of any respondent in the investigation. Here, we are assigning as BIA to these uncooperative exporters a margin of 108.00 percent for ferrovandium and nitrided vanadium. This margin represents the highest margin in the petition, as recalculated by the Department at initiation.

C. All Other Companies

We are basing the LTFV margins for all other companies, including those companies which reported that they did not sell the subject merchandise to the United States during the POI, on a simple average of the rates assigned the mandatory respondents, and the rates based on BIA. Given our concern about the role that Shieldalloy may play as both petitioner and as respondent with its related affiliate, GfE, we have

excluded GfE's rate from the calculation of the "all others" rate. A simple average, rather than a weighted-average, is applied because we do not have sufficient data to weight the individual margins.

United States Price

We based United States Price (USP) for Odermet and Tulachermet on purchase price (PP), in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold directly by the exporters to unrelated parties in the United States prior to importation and because the exporters sales price (ESP) methodology was not indicated by other circumstances. We calculated purchase price based on packed, CIF, FOB, or ex-factory prices to unrelated purchasers in the United States, and made the following deductions (where appropriate): for Odermet, foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, ocean freight containerization, and marine insurance; for Tulachermet, foreign inland freight and foreign brokerage and handling.

We based USP for Galt and GfE on ESP, in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to the first unrelated purchaser after importation into the United States. We calculated ESP based on packed delivered prices, where appropriate. For Galt, we made deductions, where appropriate, for foreign brokerage and handling, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. inland freight, U.S. duties, and U.S. brokerage and handling. For GfE, we made deductions for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. duties, U.S. brokerage and handling, inland freight, and inland insurance.

In addition, for Galt, GfE, and Tulachermet, we deducted foreign inland freight between the factory and the reported intermediate destination (e.g., Rotterdam) using reported distances and transport modes to calculate an appropriate surrogate factory-to-border or port freight amount on the basis of surrogate freight rates in South Africa. In addition, for certain sales made by Tulachermet, as well as certain shipments by GfE, we deducted port loading charges incurred in Russia based on port charges in South Africa. For all other movement expenses, we deducted the reported expenses as these services were reported to have been provided by market economy suppliers and paid in freely convertible market economy currencies. We made no deduction from USP to account for either export taxes paid by Russian companies to the Russian government or

commissions paid by Russian companies to other Russian companies because (a) the actual amounts paid are an internal expense within an NME country, and (b) there is no quantifiable good or service factor for which a surrogate value can be determined.

Further, for GfE, we made additional deductions, where appropriate, for all value added to the ESP sales of the subject merchandise in the United States, pursuant to section 772(e)(3) of the Act. The value added consists of the costs associated with the production of the further manufactured products, other than the costs associated with the imported merchandise, and a proportional amount of any profit related to the further manufacture. Profit was calculated by deducting from the sales price of the finished product the total cost of production of the imported product, based on the factors of production methodology described below, as well as all applicable movement charges. The total profit was then allocated proportionately to all components of cost. Only the profit attributable to the value added was deducted. GfE did not report the value added for certain sales. As BIA, we applied the highest amount of value added reported for all other U.S. sales.

Foreign Market Value

In accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, except for sales by Odermet, we calculated FMV for ferrovanadium and nitrided vanadium based on a valuation of factors of production reported by the factories in Russia which produced the subject merchandise. The factors used to produce ferrovanadium and nitrided vanadium include materials, labor, and energy. To calculate FMV, the reported quantities were multiplied by the appropriate surrogate values for the different inputs. (For a discussion of the complete analysis of surrogate values, see our Valuation Memorandum dated December 27, 1994.) We then added amounts for general expenses and profit, the cost of containers and coverings, and other expenses incident to placing the merchandise in condition packed and ready for shipment to the United States.

To value the raw materials, we used publicly available information for South Africa from *South Africa's Mineral Industry 1993/94* and *Southern African Customs Union Trade Statistics (SACU Trade Statistics)*.

To value vanadium slag, we used a price quote for South African vanadium slag submitted in the petition because we were unable to determine if the prices available from public sources were for unprocessed or processed

material. Among the surrogate values we had obtained, the price quote in the petition was for the material most similar to that used by the Russian producers.

To value sulfuric acid, we determined that the value derived from *SACU Trade Statistics* was inconsistent with all other values obtained for this factor. Therefore, we valued this factor based on the unit value derived from the *United Nations Trade Commodity Statistics* for Turkey. We used a Turkish value because Turkey is among those countries considered economically comparable to Russia, as noted above.

To value nitrogen, we used the Brazilian price quote from the petition, as this value was the only one available to us, and Brazil has been determined to be among those countries within a range of economic comparability to Russia in past cases (see, e.g., *Magnesium from Russia*).

To value natural gas, we used the Brazilian price included in the petition because we were unable to locate a suitable surrogate value in cubic meters to apply to the factor data reported in cubic meters. The Brazilian value was accepted for the same reasons described for nitrogen.

To value electricity, we used a rate published by the South African electrical company, ESKOM, in their 1993 annual report.

To value hourly labor rates in South Africa, we used data from *South African Central Statistics Service News Release* for labor rates in the metal manufacturing sector. As this information did not distinguish between skilled and unskilled labor, we applied a single labor value to all reported labor factors.

We were unable to obtain an appropriate factory overhead percentage based on South African experience. Accordingly, for purposes of this determination, we calculated factory overhead based on information in the petition concerning the experience of a German producer of the subject merchandise that is related to the petitioner. We used this information because the German producer's production process is similar to the Russian manufacturers', and we had no other information available.

For selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, we used the statutory minimum (section 773(e)(i)(B)(i)) of ten percent of material, labor, energy, and factory overhead because we could not obtain information based on any surrogate country's experience. For profit, we used the statutory minimum of eight percent of materials, labor, factory

overhead, and SG&A expenses for the same reason.

To value packing materials, we used information from *SACU Trade Statistics*. We added surrogate freight costs from South Africa for the delivery of inputs to the factories producing ferrovanadium and nitrided vanadium, except where this cost was already included in the surrogate value.

Tulachermet failed to report its labor factors of production. As BIA, we used the labor factors in the petition. In addition, Chusavoy and Tulachermet failed to report the distances between factory and suppliers of certain inputs. As BIA, we applied the farthest distance from all other suppliers in order to calculate the freight cost for those inputs.

FMV for Sales by Odermet

In accordance with Section 773(f) of the Act, Odermet claims that its U.S. sales should be compared to its sales to a third country because: (1) it is a reseller of the subject merchandise; (2) the Russian manufacturer does not know at the time of the sale to Odermet the country to which Odermet intends to export the merchandise; (3) the merchandise is exported by Odermet to a country other than the United States; (4) the merchandise enters the commerce of an intermediate country (Germany) but is not substantially transformed there; and (5) the merchandise is subsequently exported to the United States. Based on the information on the record to date, we have determined that, for purposes of the preliminary determination, Odermet has met the statutory criteria to consider basing its FMV on its sales to the intermediate country, Germany. We based its FMV on the methodology described below.

Cost of Production

In accordance with section 773(b) of the Act, whenever the Department has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales in the home market or third country have been made at prices less than the cost of production, it shall determine whether such sales were made at less than the cost of production. Because the price from the Russian producer to Odermet, the third country reseller, is not based on market-determined factors, we have reasonable

grounds to believe or suspect that Odermet's sales in Germany also are not based on market-determined factors and are at prices less than the cost of producing the merchandise (see Import Administration Policy Bulletin 94-1, dated March 25, 1994).

A. Calculation of COP

We calculated COP based on the factors of production for materials, labor, energy, factory overhead, SG&A, and packing reported by Odermet's supplier, Tulachermet, and valued in a surrogate country as described above.

B. Test of Third Country Sale Prices

After calculating COP, we tested whether third country sales of the subject merchandise were at prices below COP.

We compared COP to reported prices that were net of movement charges. If over 90 percent of a respondent's sales were at prices above the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales because we determined that the respondent's below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities. If between ten and 90 percent of a respondent's sales were at prices above the COP, we discarded only the below-cost sales if made over an extended period of time. Where we found that more than 90 percent of respondent's sales were at prices below the COP over an extended period of time, we disregarded all sales and calculated FMV based on the factors of production methodology described above.

In order to determine whether below-cost sales were made over an extended period of time, we performed the following analysis: (1) if a respondent sold a product in only one or two months of the POI and there were sales in those months below the COP, or (2) if a respondent sold a product during three months or more of the POI and there were sales below the COP during three or more of those months, then below-cost sales were considered to have been made over an extended period of time.

C. Results of COP Test

We found that more than 90 percent of third country sales were at below-COP prices over an extended period of time. We have no information indicating whether the below cost sales were at

prices that would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. Accordingly, we based FMV for all U.S. sales on the factors of production methodology.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank, or at the rates published by the International Monetary Fund in *International Financial Statistics*.

Verification

As provided in section 776(b) of the Act, we will verify information determined to be acceptable for use in making our final determination.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(1) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of ferrovanadium and nitrided vanadium from the Russian Federation entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The Customs Service shall require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated amount by which the FMV exceeds the USP as shown below. These suspension of liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice.

Consistent with our practice in investigations involving imports from NME countries, we calculated a single rate applicable to all exporters in the Russian Federation who have not established eligibility for a separate rate. Tulachermet accounts for all exports by known Russian exporters during the POI. While we have received information on four Russian customers that purchased the subject merchandise, we have no information, at this time, indicating that any of them are exporters. Accordingly, the only rate calculated for a Russian exporter is the Tulachermet rate. Because Tulachermet is the only identified Russian exporter, there is no need to address Tulachermet's separate rate request at this time.

The estimated dumping margins are as follows:

| Manufacturer/producer/exporter | Weighted-average margin |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| All exporters located in Russia including SC Vanadium-Tulachermet | 56.15% |
| Galt Alloys, Inc. | 40.46% |
| Gesellschaft für Elektrometallurgie m.b.H./Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation/Metallurg, Inc. | 49.18% |
| Marc Rich Co., AG/Glencore International AG | 108.00% |
| Odermet, Ltd. | 28.25% |

| Manufacturer/producer/exporter | Weighted-average margin |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Wogan Resources, Ltd. | 108.00% |
| All Others not located in Russia | 68.17% |

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine 45 days after our final determination whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry.

Public Comment

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38, case briefs or other written comments in at least ten copies must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration no later than March 27, 1995, and rebuttal briefs, no later than April 3, 1995. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(b), we will hold a public hearing, if requested, to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs. Tentatively, the hearing will be held on April 5, 1995, at 10:00 a.m. at the U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1851, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20230. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room B-099, within ten days of the publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) the party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(b), oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. If this investigation proceeds normally, we will make our final determination by the 135th day after the date of publication of the affirmative preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**.

This determination is published pursuant to section 733(f) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.15(a)(4).

Dated: December 27, 1994.

Barbara R. Stafford,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-160 Filed 1-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DO-P

Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

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), we invite comments on the question of whether instruments of equivalent scientific value, for the purposes for which the instruments shown below are intended to be used, are being manufactured in the United States.

Comments must comply with 15 CFR 301.5(a)(3) and (4) of the regulations and be filed within 20 days with the Statutory Import Programs Staff, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 94-141. Applicant: Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division, 345 Middlefield Rd., Mail Stop 434, Menlo Park, CA 94025. **Instrument:** SIR Mass Spectrometer, Model PRISM. **Manufacturer:** Fisons Instruments, United Kingdom. **Intended Use:** The instrument will be used for the expansion of existing research projects in Water Resources and Geologic Divisions which include studying carbon and nitrogen cycles in soils, sediments, estuaries, deltas, streams, coastal plans, arctic and other peat deposits, and lakes. **Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs:** December 6, 1994.

Docket Number: 94-142. Applicant: Kansas State University, Department of Agronomy, 2004 Throckmorton Plant Science Center, Manhattan, KS 66506-5501. **Instrument:** IR Mass Spectrometer System, Model 20-20. **Manufacturer:** Europa Scientific, United Kingdom. **Intended Use:** The instrument will be used for carbon and nitrogen stable isotope tracer studies in agronomic, environmental, and ecological research. It is essential for basic research on C and N cycling in soils and applied research on improving N fertilizer use efficiency by soil management and breeding techniques. **Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs:** December 7, 1994.

Docket Number: 94-143. Applicant: U.S. Bureau of Mines, Bldg. 20, Denver

Federal Center, Denver, CO 80225.

Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model CM 200. **Manufacturer:** Philips, The Netherlands. **Intended Use:** The instrument will be used to explore, in depth, the microstructure-property relationships in a wide range of materials. Specific experiments include routine minerals and materials characterization, second-phase analyses, interface and grain boundary characterization, dislocation and other fault analyses, and powder and particle characterization. **Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs:** December 8, 1994.

Docket Number: 94-144. Applicant: University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign, Purchasing Division, 506 Wright Street, Urbana, IL 61801.

Instrument: Gas Composition Analyzer, Model Epison II. **Manufacturer:** Thomas Swan, United Kingdom. **Intended Use:** The instrument will be used for studies of binary mixtures of hydrogen and trimethyl indium during investigations to develop novel electro-optic devices and broaden the knowledge of these types of devices. **Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs:** December 8, 1994.

Docket Number: 94-145. Applicant: Miami University, Office of Purchasing, 213 Roudebush Hall, Oxford, OH 45056. **Instrument:** Cryostage. **Manufacturer:** Linkham Scientific Instruments, Ltd., United Kingdom. **Intended Use:** The instrument will be used to study the effects of low temperatures on various tissues isolated from naturally cold tolerant vertebrates and invertebrates and to study the application of low temperature preservation to mammalian tissues. In addition, the instrument will be used by students in several zoology courses. **Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs:** December 15, 1994.

Docket Number: 94-146. Applicant: Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Department of Civil Engineering, P.O. Box 909, Piscataway, NJ 08855-0909. **Instrument:** Test Frame with Accessories. **Manufacturer:** Hi-Tech Ltd., United Kingdom. **Intended Use:** The instrument will be used in a course which trains students in the testing of the mechanical properties and behavior of structural elements under a variety of load conditions. **Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs:** December 14, 1994.