

manufacture and the resulting figure was added to the constructed value in the petition's margin calculation. Selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit in the petition's margin calculations for pure magnesium from Ukraine were also recalculated accordingly to account for factory overhead. In addition, the Indonesian surrogate value for one of the missing input values was also figured in the revised margin calculation. The petitioners requested that the missing material values be based on material values originally reported in the petition. However, the petition's unit value for one of the material inputs at issue was already determined by the Department to be inappropriate. Accordingly, the Department determined that the surrogate value for the factor more reasonably reflects the value of the factor in the production process.

The other material input in question could not be valued since the petition provided no specific quantity data or description of the factor for determining an appropriate unit value.

#### Addenda to Preliminary Determinations

In our October 27, 1994, preliminary determinations in these proceedings, we stated that we would impose company-specific duty deposit rates on certain non-participating mandatory respondents whose identities were business proprietary and thus could not be disclosed. Subsequent to publication of those determinations, we were informed by the U.S. Customs Service that it could not administer suspension-of-liquidation instructions that involved unidentified companies. Accordingly, we did not assign company-specific deposit rates to these companies; instead, entries of merchandise sold by these companies are subject to the "All Others" deposit rate.

#### Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(2) of the Act, the Department will direct the U.S. Customs Service to continue to require cash deposit or posting of bond on all entries of subject merchandise from Russia and Ukraine for non-cooperative respondents and for "all others" at the newly calculated rates, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The suspension-of-liquidation will remain in effect until further notice. The revised company-specific BIA margins for non-cooperative respondents and the "all others" rate as well as Gerald Metals'

revised margin for pure magnesium from Ukraine are as follows:

	Pure magnesium (percent)	Alloy magnesium (percent)
Russia:		
F&S .....	100.25	153.65
W&O Bergmann .....	100.25	153.65
Derek Raphael & Co. ....	100.25	153.65
Marco Trading .....	100.25	153.65
Wogen Group .....	100.25	153.65
Alex .....	100.25	153.65
"All others" .....	94.30	153.65
Ukraine:		
Gerald Metals .....	83.32	
Alusuisse-Lonza .....	104.27	
Derek Raphael .....	104.27	
Marco Trading .....	104.27	
Wogen Group .....	104.27	
Alex .....	104.27	
Mages .....	104.27	
F&S .....	104.27	
"All others" .....	99.81	

#### ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of the amended preliminary determinations. If our final determinations are affirmative, the ITC will determine whether imports of the subject merchandise are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry, before the later of 120 days after the date of the original preliminary determinations (October 27, 1994) or 45 days after our final determinations.

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

Dated: January 31, 1995.

**Susan G. Esserman,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-3133 Filed 2-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-201-504]

#### Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware From Mexico; Amendment to Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of amendment to final results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** We are amending the final results of our administrative review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from Mexico, published on January 9, 1995 (60 FR 2378). The amended notice reflects the correction of a ministerial

error made in the calculation of cost of production in the final results. We are publishing this amendment in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 8, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lorenza Olivas or Rick Herring, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-2786.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The review covered two exporters, CINSA, S.A., and Acero Porcelanizado, S.A. (APSA), and the period December 1, 1990 through November 30, 1991. The Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results on February 11, 1994 (59 FR 6616), and the final results on January 9, 1995 (60 FR 2378) of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from Mexico (58 FR 43327).

##### Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of porcelain-on-steel cooking ware, including tea kettles, which do not have self-contained electric heating elements. All of the foregoing are constructed of steel and are enameled or glazed with vitreous glasses. This merchandise is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item number 7323.94.00. Kitchenware currently entering under HTS item number 7323.94.00.30 is not subject to the order. The HTS item number is provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

##### Amendment of Final Results

On January 13, 1995, CINSA, S.A., alleged that the Department made a clerical error in calculating the cost of production. CINSA argues that, in accounting for the effects of inflation on depreciation expense, the Department overstated the cost of production by applying an incorrect factor to fixed overhead expense.

Petitioner argues that the Department accurately implemented its intention in calculating the cost of production.

We agree with CINSA. We reviewed our calculation and have determined that the computer instructions applied an incorrect factor to total fixed overhead. Our intent was to account only for the effects of inflation on depreciation expense because all other

fixed overhead costs already reflected inflation. We have, therefore, amended our calculation of fixed overhead by applying a factor to fixed overhead to account only for the effects of inflation on depreciation expense.

#### Final Results of Review

Upon review of comments submitted, the Department has determined the margin for CINSAs to be 13.35 percent for the period December 1, 1990 through November 30, 1991. The Customs Service shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these amended final results of review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act): (1) the cash deposit rate for CINSAs will be 13.35 percent as outlined above; (2) the cash deposit rate for APSAs will continue to be 4.66 percent, the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV), but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other exporters will be 29.52 percent, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See, Floral Trade Council v. United States*, Slip Op. 93-79, and *Federal Mogul Corp. v. United States*, Slip Op. 93-83.

These deposit requirements, when imposed, 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 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during the review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

In addition, this notice serves as a 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 353.34(d). Timely written notification or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested.

Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of the APO is a sanctionable violation.

This notice is in accordance with sections 751(f) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(f)) and 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Dated: February 2, 1995.

**Susan G. Esserman,**

*Assistant Secretary, for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-3134 Filed 2-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

#### Meeting of the Commission on Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces

**AGENCY:** Department of Defense, Commission on Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** On January 25, 1995, 60 FR 4892, the Department of Defense published a notice concerning a meeting of the Commission on Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces. The open portion of this meeting, from 12:45 p.m. until 2:15 p.m., was cancelled. All other information remains unchanged.

Extraordinary circumstances compel this amendment to be posted in less than the 15-day requirement.

Dated: February 3, 1995.

**Patricia L. Toppings,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 94-3163 Filed 2-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-4-M

#### Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, Scientific Advisory Board

**ACTION:** Notice

In accordance with Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P.L. 92-463), announcement is made of the following Committee meeting:

*Date of Meeting:* March 7-9, 1995 from 0830 to approximately 1630.

*Place:* U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.

*Matters to be Considered:* Research and Development proposals and continuing projects requesting Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program funds in excess of \$1M will be reviewed.

This meeting is open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the Scientific Advisory Board at the time and in the manner permitted by the Board.

*For Further Information Contact:* Ms. Amy Levine, 901 North Street, Suite 303, Arlington, VA, 22203, (703) 696-2124.

Dated: February 2, 1995.

**L.M. Bynum,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 95-3027 Filed 2-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

## Department of the Army

### Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Proposed Section 204 Habitat Restoration Project at Poplar Island in Talbot County, MD

**AGENCY:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of Intent.

**SUMMARY:** The Baltimore District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is investigating the use of dredged material to restore Poplar Island. The project would restore Poplar Island to its approximate size in 1857, thereby adding approximately 1,000 acres of wildlife habitat in the Upper Chesapeake Bay. The project would use approximately 10 to 40 million cubic yards of clean material, dredged primarily from the southern approach channels to Baltimore Harbor. The amount of material placed at the site would depend on the final design, including the island size and shape, and the relative proportions of upland and wetland habitat constructed on the island. Dredged material would be placed behind dikes at the site, then shaped and planted to create both intertidal wetland and upland wildlife habitat. The feasibility study is being conducted under the authority of Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. The potential non-Federal sponsor for the project is the Maryland Port Administration (MPA), a part of the Maryland Department of Transportation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Questions about the proposed action and DEIS can be addressed to Ms. Stacey Brown, Project Manager, Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, ATTN: CENAB-PL-PC, P.O. Box 1715, Baltimore, Maryland 21203-1715, telephone (410) 962-3639.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. The project will be constructed under Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, which allows Federal funding for the protection, restoration, and creation of aquatic and ecologically related