

Scenic Rivers Act which required the Forest Service to develop a management plan for the Minam River. Interim direction was identified in the Forest Plan as Management Area 7 (Wild and Scenic Rivers). The environmental assessment documents the analysis of alternatives to managing the Minam River Wild and Scenic River in accordance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

This decision is subject to appeal pursuant to Forest Service regulations 36 CFR part 217. Appeals must be filed within 45 days from the date of publication in the Baker City Herald. Notices of Appeals must meet the requirement of 36 CFR 217.9.

The environmental assessment for the Eagle Cap Wilderness-Minam River Wild and Scenic River Management

Plan is available for the public review at the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest Supervisor's Office in Baker City, Oregon.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** Implementation of this decision shall not occur within 30 days following publication of the legal notice of the decision in the Baker City Herald.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

For further information, contact Gay Brockus (503-523-1250) or Steve Davis (503-523-1316), at the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, P.O. Box 907, Baker City, Oregon 97814.

Dated: December 21, 1994.

**R.M. Richmond,**

*Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 95-56 Filed 1-3-95; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Fish and Wildlife Service**

**Federal Subsistence Management Program in Alaska Meetings**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA; Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Meetings.

**TIMES, DATES AND LOCATIONS:** The Federal Subsistence Board announces the forthcoming Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (Regional Council) meetings:

Regional council meetings:	
Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Council, Community Hall, Mountain Village, AK .....	Jan. 25-26, 1995.
Northwest Arctic Regional Council, Alaska Technical Center, Kotzebue, AK .....	Feb. 2, 1995.
Southeast Regional Council, Hoonah, AK .....	Feb. 8-10, 1995.
Bristol Bay Regional Council, Naknek, AK .....	Feb. 15-17, 1995.
Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Council, Old Harbor, AK .....	Feb. 16-17, 1995.
North Slope Regional Council, Barrow, AK .....	Feb. 16-17, 1995.
Seward Peninsula Regional Council, White Mountain, AK .....	Feb. 23-24, 1995.
Western Interior Regional Council, Huslia, AK .....	Feb. 23-24, 1995.
Southcentral Regional Council, Anchorage, AK .....	Feb. 27-Mar. 1, 1995.
Eastern Interior Regional Council, Northway, AK .....	Mar. 1-3, 1995.

Specific times and locations will be published in local and Statewide newspapers as soon as available. All meetings are subject to change due to adverse weather restricting travel.

**SUMMARY:** The public is invited to participate in these upcoming Regional Council meetings. After the public testimony, individuals will be able to listen to the Regional Council's deliberation on the agenda items.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:** The Regional Councils will make recommendations on proposals for Federal subsistence seasons and harvest limits for the 1995-1996 regulatory year. The Regional Councils may also discuss other issues concerning the Federal Subsistence Management Program.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, c/o Richard Pospahala, Office of Subsistence Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1011 E. Tudor Road, Anchorage, Alaska 99503; telephone (907)-786-3447.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Regional Councils have been established in accordance with Section 805 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, Pub. L. 96-487, and Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, subparts A,

B, and C (57 FR 22940-22964). They advise the Federal Government on all matters related to the subsistence taking of fish and wildlife on public lands in Alaska and operate in accordance with provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The public is invited to participate in the Regional Council meetings.

The Federal Subsistence Board was established in accordance with Section 814 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, Pub. L. 96-487, and Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, subparts A, B, and C (57 FR 22940-22964). The Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture delegated responsibility for administering the subsistence taking and use of fish and wildlife on public lands to this body. Their meetings are open and the public is invited to participate.

Dated: December 19, 1994.

**William L. Hensley,**

*Chair, Federal Subsistence Board.*

[FR Doc. 95-82 Filed 1-3-95; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

[A-570-834]

**Preliminary Determination of Critical Circumstances: Disposable Pocket Lighters From the People's Republic of China**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 4, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Julie Anne Osgood or Cynthia Thirumalai, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-0167 or 482-4087, respectively.

**Preliminary Determination of Critical Circumstances**

On December 5, 1994, the Department of Commerce (the Department) preliminarily determined that disposable pocket lighters from the People's Republic of China (PRC) are

being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (59 FR 64191, December 13, 1994). On November 23, 1994, petitioner alleged that there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of subject merchandise. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.16(b)(2)(ii), since this allegation was filed later than 20 days before the scheduled date of the preliminary determination, we must issue our preliminary critical circumstances determination not later than 30 days after the allegation was submitted.

Section 733(e)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), provides that the Department will determine that there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances exist if:

(A) (i) there is a history of dumping in the United States or elsewhere of the class or kind of merchandise which is the subject of the investigation, or

(ii) the person by whom, or for whose account, the merchandise was imported knew or should have known that the exporter was selling the merchandise which is the subject of the investigation at less than its fair value, and

(B) there have been massive imports of the class or kind of merchandise which is the subject of the investigation over a relatively short period.

### History of Dumping

In this investigation, the first criterion of analysis is addressed in petitioner's May 9, 1994, submission. Exhibit 30 to the petition provides documentation indicating that the European Community imposed antidumping duties on such or similar merchandise produced and exported from the PRC in November 1991. Therefore, petitioner has established that there is a history of dumping elsewhere of such lighters by PRC producers/exporters.

### Importer Knowledge

With respect to the alternative first criterion, we have consistently determined that preliminary antidumping duty margins in excess of 25 percent on U.S. purchase price sales are sufficient to impute importer knowledge of sales at less than fair value. See, *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Metal from China* (56 FR 18570, April 23, 1991) and *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Extruded Rubber Thread from Malaysia* (57 FR 38465, August 25, 1992). In this investigation, China National Overseas Trading Corporation (Ningbo) ("COTCO"), Guangdong Light

Industrial Products Import & Export Corporation ("GLIP"), PolyCity Industrial Ltd. ("PolyCity"), and all non-responding companies received preliminary antidumping duty margins in excess of 25 percent. Therefore, we preliminarily determine that importers either knew or should have known that such exporters were selling disposable pocket lighters at less than fair value.

### Massive Imports

Because we have preliminarily found that the first statutory criterion is met for finding critical circumstances in that there is a history of dumping of the subject merchandise and, alternatively, there is actual or imputed importer knowledge of sales at less than fair value for certain companies, we must consider the second statutory criterion: whether imports of the merchandise have been massive over a relatively short period.

According to 19 CFR 353.16(f) and 353.16(g), we consider the following to determine whether imports have been massive over a relatively short period of time: 1) volume and value of the imports; 2) seasonal trends (if applicable); and 3) the share of domestic consumption accounted for by the imports.

When examining volume and value data, the Department typically compares the export volume for equal periods immediately preceding and following the filing of the petition. Under 19 CFR 353.16(f)(2), unless the imports in the comparison period have increased by at least 15 percent over the imports during the base period, we will not consider the imports to have been "massive."

To determine whether there have been massive imports over a relatively short period of time, the Department examines shipment information submitted by the respondent or import statistics when respondent-specific shipment information is not available.

On December 9, 1994, the Department sent respondents requests for information regarding shipments of disposable pocket lighters for the period January 1992 to December 1994. We received the requested information filed in proper form on December 19, 1994, for COTCO, GLIP, Gao Yao (HK) Hua Fa Industrial Co., Ltd. ("Gao Yao"), and PolyCity. For these responding companies, we used company-specific shipment data in this investigation and the related analysis. Cli-Claque Company, Ltd. ("Cli-Claque") did not submit information for this preliminary critical circumstances determination.

To determine whether or not imports of disposable pocket lighters have been massive over a relatively short period,

we compared each respondent's export volume for the seven months subsequent to the filing of the petition (May through November 1994) to that during the seven months prior to the filing of the petition (October 1993 through April 1994). This period was selected based on the Department's practice of using the longest period for which information is available from the month that the petition was submitted through the effective date of the preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value, which in this investigation was December 5, 1994. See *Preliminary Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances; Silicon Carbide From the People's Republic of China* (59 FR 16795, April 8, 1994). We were unable to consider the share of domestic consumption accounted for by the imports, pursuant to 353.16(f)(1)(iii), because the available data did not permit such a post-filing analysis. In addition, we found no evidence of seasonality, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.16(f)(i)(ii), with respect to PRC exports of disposable pocket lighters to the United States.

Respondents have argued that any increases in PRC lighter imports after the filing of the petition were in anticipation of the Consumer Product Safety Commission child-proof lighter requirements due to become effective on July 12, 1994. (See *Safety Standard for Cigarette Lighters* (58 FR 37557, July 12, 1993).) The evidence on the record at this time is insufficient to support the legal and factual bases for this argument. We will address this argument further in our final determination.

Based on the responding companies' shipment information, we preliminarily find that imports of disposable pocket lighters from the PRC have been massive over a relatively short period for COTCO. We preliminarily find that imports were not massive with respect to Gao Yao, GLIP, and PolyCity. (See business proprietary memorandum from team to file, dated December 23, 1994.)

Therefore, because there is a history of dumping of such or similar merchandise, and, alternatively, importers knew or should have known that the exporter was selling the merchandise at less than its fair value, and imports of disposable pocket lighters have been massive over a relatively short period of time, we preliminarily determine that there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of disposable pocket lighters from COTCO. Because imports from Gao Yao, GLIP and PolyCity have not been massive, we preliminarily

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 Promsyrioimport, 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