

equivalent (resource planning decisions). Further public participation will be sought during Allotment Management Planning NEPA analysis and public scoping.

Preliminary planning assessments (initiated in 1990) included: public sensing, data collection, and analysis for development of desired conditions. Public participation is especially important at several points during the analysis. Individuals, organizations, federal, state, and local agencies who are interested in, or affected by the decision are invited to participate in the scoping process. Your responses will be used in preparation of the draft EIS.

The Responsible Officials for this decision are Bert Kulesza, Forest Supervisor, Ashley National Forest, 355 N. Vernal Ave., Vernal UT 84078, and Bernie Weingardt, Forest Supervisor, Wasatch-Cache National Forest, 8230 Federal Building, 125 South State St., Salt Lake City, UT 84138.

To complete the scoping process, we need your comments by June 19, 1995. The next major opportunity for public input is the draft EIS. The draft EIS is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and be available for public review in July, 1995. The Final EIS and Record of Decision is expected in November, 1995.

The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement is 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency's notice of availability appears in the **Federal Register**. It is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate at that time. To be the most helpful, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible and may address the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed (see *The Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act* at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points).

In addition, Federal court decisions have established that reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts the agency to the reviewers' position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, (9th Circuit, 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490

F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). The reason for this is to ensure that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in a final.

Dated: May 5, 1995.

Bert Kulesza,

Forest Supervisor, Ashley National Forest.
[FR Doc. 95-11935 Filed 5-15-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Intergovernmental Advisory Committee Meeting

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Intergovernmental Advisory Committee (IAC) will meet on June 1, 1995, at the Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel, 8235 NE. Airport Way, Portland, Oregon 97230. The purpose of the meeting is to continue discussions on the implementation of the Northwest Forest Plan. The meeting will begin at 9 a.m. on June 1 and continue until 5 p.m. Agenda items to be covered include: (1) Discussions on revisions to the federal watershed analysis guide; (2) a report on the federal "jobs-in-the-woods" program; (3) a report on the final draft implementation monitoring plan, and discussions regarding monitoring; and (4) an update on information data sharing efforts on specific activities. The IAC meeting will be open to the public. Written comments may be submitted for the record at the meeting. Time will also be scheduled for oral public comments. Interested persons are encouraged to attend.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Questions regarding this meeting may be directed to Don Knowles, Executive Director, Regional Ecosystem Office, 333 SW. 1st Avenue, PO Box 3623, Portland, OR 97208 (Phone: 503-326-6265).

Dated: May 10, 1995.

G.S. Sims,

Acting Designated Federal Official.
[FR Doc. 95-11963 Filed 5-15-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Southwest Washington Provincial Advisory Committee; Meeting

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Southwest Washington Provincial Advisory Committee will meet on June 7, 1995, in Tumwater, Washington, at the Tyee Motor Inn, near

Interstate 5 at Exit No. 102. The meeting will begin at 9 a.m. and continue until 4:30 p.m. The purpose of the meeting is to provide Advisory Committee members information on Gifford Pinchot National Forest land and resource management programs, and their relationships to the President's Northwest Forest Plan.

Agenda items to be covered include: (1) Approval of previous meeting minutes; (2) Advisory Committee updates on agency/interest activities; (3) Forest presentation of 1996 program of work; (4) Advisory Committee discussions on program of work; (5) Public Open Forum; (6) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service presentation on "Jobs-in-the-Woods" program; and (7) Status report on Cispus Adaptive Management Area Strategy.

All Southwest Washington Provincial Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public. Interested citizens are encouraged to attend. The "open forum" provides opportunity for the public to bring issues, concerns, and discussion topics to the Advisory Committee. The "open forum" is scheduled near the conclusion of this meeting. Interested speakers will need to register at the door. The committee welcomes the public's written comments on committee business at any time.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Direct questions regarding this meeting to Mark Maggiora, Public Affairs Officer, at (360) 750-5007, or write Forest Headquarters Office, Gifford Pinchot National Forest, 6926 E. Fourth Plain Blvd., PO Box 8944, Vancouver, WA 98668.

Dated: May 10, 1995.

Richard Stem,

Resources Staff Officer.
[FR Doc. 95-11967 Filed 5-15-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-841]

Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of the Final Determination: Manganese Sulfate From the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 16, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Dorothy Tomaszewski or Erik Warga, Office of Antidumping Investigations,

Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0631 or (202) 482-0922, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Preliminary Determination

We preliminarily determine that manganese sulfate from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") is being, or is 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 the initiation of this investigation on December 20, 1994, (59 FR 66908, December 28, 1994), the following events have occurred:

On December 29, 1994, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") requested the PRC's Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation ("MOFTEC") and the China Chamber of Commerce for Import and Export of Metals, Minerals and Chemicals ("the Chamber") to identify all producers and exporters who sold manganese sulfate to the United States during the period of investigation. The Department also asked MOFTEC and the Chamber to provide information on whether the companies named in the petition or identified by the Department exported the subject merchandise during the period of investigation. The Chamber identified two PRC exporters: Hunan Chemicals Import and Export Company ("Hunan Chemicals"), and China National Nonferrous Metals Import and Export Company (Hunan) ("CNIEC"). However, neither MOFTEC nor the Chamber addressed the Department's question concerning the export activities of the companies identified in the petition or by the Department.

On January 14, 1995, the U.S. International Trade Commission ("ITC") notified the Department of its preliminary determination that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of imports of manganese sulfate from the PRC that are alleged to be sold at less than fair value.

On February 23, 1995, the Department sent questionnaires to MOFTEC and the Chamber, requesting that the questionnaire be transmitted to all companies that produce manganese sulfate for export to the United States and to all companies that were engaged in selling manganese sulfate to the United States during the period of investigation. Courtesy copies of the questionnaire were also transmitted to all companies listed in the petition or identified by the Chamber.

On April 7, 1995, the Department received responses to the questionnaire from two trading companies identified by the Chamber, Hunan Chemicals and CNIEC, and their supplying producers, Xian Lu Chemical Plant and Yan Jiang Chemical Plant. Supplemental information was received on April 27, 1995. No other PRC companies responded to the Department's questionnaire.

In response to the Department's April 14, 1995, request, both petitioner and respondents submitted information on the record regarding publicly available published information on surrogate country selection and factors of production.

Postponement of Final Determination

Pursuant to section 735(a)(2)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.20(b)(1), on May 5, 1995, the four respondents, Hunan Chemicals, CNIEC, Yan Jiang Chemical Plant and Xian Lu Chemical Plant, 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 in the **Federal Register**. Therefore, because there are no compelling reasons to deny the request, we are postponing the final determination until the 135th day after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

Scope of Investigation

The product covered by this investigation is manganese sulfate, including manganese sulfate monohydrate (MnSO₄H₂O) and any other forms, whether or not hydrated, without regard to form, shape or size, the addition of other elements, the presence of other elements as impurities, and/or the method of manufacture. The subject merchandise is currently classifiable under subheading 2833.29.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, our

written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation ("POI") is June 1, 1994, through November 30, 1994.

Separate Rates

Each of the responding PRC trading companies has requested a separate, company-specific rate. According to their respective business licenses, Hunan Chemicals and CNIEC are public-owned enterprises ("owned by all the people").

As stated in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China* (59 FR 22585, 22586, May 2, 1994) ("*Silicon Carbide*"), and the *Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Sebacic Acid from the People's Republic of China* (59 FR 28053, May 31, 1994 ("*Sebacic Acid*")), ownership of a company by all the people does not require the application of a single rate. Accordingly, each of the two trading companies is eligible for consideration for a separate rate.

To establish whether a trading company is sufficiently independent from government control to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under a test arising out of the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 20588, May 6, 1991) ("*Sparklers*") and amplified in *Silicon Carbide*. Under the separate rates criteria, the Department assigns separate rates in nonmarket economy cases only if respondents can demonstrate the absence of both *de jure* and *de facto* governmental control over export activities.

1. Absence of De Jure Control

Several laws and regulations are on the record in this investigation that demonstrate absence of *de jure* control for Hunan Chemicals and CNIEC, including two enactments indicating that the responsibility for managing enterprises "owned by all of the people" is with the enterprises themselves and not with the government. These are the "Law of the People's Republic of China on Industrial Enterprises Owned by the Whole People," adopted on April 13, 1988 ("*1988 Law*"); the "Regulations for Transformation of Operational Mechanism of State-Owned Industrial Enterprises," approved on August 23, 1992 ("*1992 Regulations*"); the "Temporary Provisions for Administration of Export Commodities," approved on August 23,

1992 ("1992 Export Provisions"), and the April 1994 "Emergent Notice of Changes in Issuing Authority for Export Licenses Regarding Public Quota Bidding for Certain Commodities" ("1994 Quota Measure").

The 1988 Law and 1992 Regulations shifted control of enterprises owned by all the people from the government to the enterprises themselves. The 1988 Law provides that enterprises owned "by the whole people" shall make their own management decisions, be responsible for their own profits and losses, choose their own suppliers, and purchase their own goods and materials. The 1988 Law also has other provisions which support a finding that such enterprises have management independence from the government in making management decisions. The 1992 Regulations provide that these same enterprises can, for example, set their own prices (Article IX); make their own production decisions (Article XI); use their own retained foreign exchange (Article XII); allocate profits (Article II); sell their own products without government interference (Article X); make their own investment decisions (Article XIII); dispose of their own assets (Article XV); and hire and fire their employees without government approval (Article XVII).

The 1992 Export Provisions list those products subject to direct government control. Manganese sulfate is not included in the 1992 Export Provisions and does not, therefore, appear to be subject to the export constraints of these provisions. The 1994 Quota Measure supersedes earlier laws dealing with the export of the named commodities. Manganese sulfate was not named in the 1994 Quota Measure and does not, therefore, appear to be subject to the export quota regulation of this measure.

As stated in previous cases, there is some evidence that the provisions of the above-cited laws regarding enterprise autonomy have not been implemented uniformly among different sectors and/or jurisdictions in the PRC (see "PRC Government Findings on Enterprise Autonomy," in *Foreign Broadcast Information Service-China-93-133* (July 14, 1993)). Therefore, the Department has determined that an analysis of *de facto* control is critical to determining whether respondents are, in fact, subject to a degree of governmental control which would preclude the Department from assigning separate rates.

2. Absence of *De Facto* Control

The Department typically considers four factors in evaluating whether each respondent is subject to *de facto* governmental control of its export

functions: (1) Whether the export prices are set by or subject to the approval of a governmental authority; (2) whether the respondent has authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements; (3) whether the respondent has autonomy from the government in making decisions regarding the selection of management; and (4) whether the respondent retains the proceeds of its export sales and makes independent decisions regarding disposition of profits or financing of losses (see *Silicon Carbide* and *Sebacic Acid*).

Hunan Chemicals and CNIEC have each asserted that it: (1) Establishes its own export prices; (2) negotiates contracts on a case by case basis based on market conditions, without guidance from any governmental entities or organizations; (3) makes its own personnel decisions; and (4) retains the proceeds of its export sales, uses profits according to its business needs and has the authority to sell its assets and to obtain loans. In addition, questionnaire responses indicate that company-specific pricing during the POI does not suggest coordination among exporters (*i.e.*, the prices for manganese sulfate differ among companies). This information supports a preliminary finding that there is a *de facto* absence of governmental control of the export activities of these firms.

Consequently, we preliminarily determine that Hunan Chemicals and CNIEC have met the criteria for the application of separate rates.

Nonmarket Economy Country Status

The Department has treated the PRC as a nonmarket economy country ("NME") in all past antidumping investigations and administrative reviews (see, *e.g.*, *Sebacic Acid* and *Silicon Carbide*). Neither respondents nor petitioners have challenged such treatment. Therefore, in accordance with section 771(18)(c) of the Act, we will continue to treat the PRC as an NME in this investigation.

When the Department is investigating imports from an NME, section 773(c)(1) of the Act directs us to base FMV on the NME producers' factors of production, valued in a comparable market economy that is a significant producer of the subject or comparable merchandise. Section 773(c)(2) of the Act alternatively provides that when available information is inadequate for using the factors of production methodology, FMV may be based on the export prices for comparable merchandise from market economy countries at a comparable level of economic development.

For purposes of the preliminary determination, we have relied on the methodology provided by section 773(c)(1) of the Act to determine FMV. The sources of individual factor prices are discussed under the FMV section, below.

Surrogate Country

Section 773(c)(4) of the Act requires the Department to value the NME producers' factors of production, to the extent possible, in one or more market economy countries that (1) are at a level of economic development comparable to that of the NME country, and (2) are significant producers of comparable merchandise. The Department has determined that India, Indonesia, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka are the countries most comparable to the PRC in terms of overall economic development (see Memorandum from David Mueller, Director, Office of Policy, to Gary Taverman, Acting Director, Office of Antidumping Investigations, dated April 13, 1995). According to the information we have gathered, India, with two production facilities, appears to be the only producer of manganese sulfate among these six potential surrogate countries. India is also endowed with a primary material for producing the subject merchandise, manganese ore. Because India meets both statutory criteria, we have calculated foreign market value ("FMV") using Indian prices for the PRC producers' factors of production. We have obtained and relied upon published, publicly available information wherever possible.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of manganese sulfate from the PRC to the United States by Hunan Chemicals and CNIEC were made at less than fair value, we compared the United States price ("USP") to the FMV, as specified in the "United States Price" and "Foreign Market Value" sections of this notice.

United States Price

For Hunan Chemicals, we based USP on purchase price, in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold directly by the PRC exporters to unrelated parties in the United States prior to importation into the United States. We calculated purchase price based on FOB foreign-port prices to unrelated purchasers. Where necessary, we made deductions for foreign inland freight valued in India.

For CNIEC, we based USP on exporter's sales price ("ESP"), in accordance with section 772(c) of the

Act. We calculated ESP based on packed delivered prices, where appropriate. Where necessary, we made deductions for foreign inland freight valued in India.

We also made deductions, where appropriate, for ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. inland freight (including warehousing), U.S. duties, U.S. brokerage and handling. Additionally, where appropriate, we deducted an amount to account for added value associated with further processing after the merchandise was imported into the United States and before the merchandise was shipped to the U.S. customer, in accordance with section 772(e)(3) of the Act.

Foreign Market Value

In accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, we calculated FMV based on factors of production reported by the factories in the PRC which produced the subject merchandise for the two exporters. The factors used to produce the subject merchandise include materials, labor, factory overhead, selling, general and administrative expenses, profit and packing. The reported factor quantities were multiplied by Indian values except where otherwise noted. For a complete analysis of surrogate values, see the *Calculation Memorandum*, dated May 9, 1995, for this investigation.

To value materials, we used the following sources of publicly available information for India in the *Indian Foreign Trade Statistics—Imports*, ("Indian Import Statistics") for April–June 1994; the *India Minerals Yearbook* for 1990–1991; and prices published in the June 16, 1994, *Gazette of India*. For data from *Indian Import Statistics* and the *Gazette of India*, no adjustment for inflation was necessary since the data was for a portion of the POI. For the *India Minerals Yearbook*, we adjusted the 1990–1991 prices to account for inflation using wholesale price indices for India as reported in the International Monetary Fund's *International Financial Statistics (IFS)*.

To adjust certain material values to account for source-to-factory freight, we used Indian freight rates from a 1991 cable from the U.S. Embassy in Delhi and adjusted accordingly for inflation. (See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China* (57 FR 21058, May 18, 1992)).

To value labor amounts for production and packing, we used 1990 labor data for India, as reported in the *1994 ILO Yearbook*. We adjusted labor wage rates to account for inflation using

consumer price indices for India as reported in the *IFS*.

To value fuel, we used 1993 data for India from the Energy Information Administration's *International Energy Annual* and adjusted accordingly for inflation.

To value electricity, we used information for India from the Asian Development Bank's FY1994 *Electric Utilities Data Book for Asian and Pacific Region*. No adjustment to account for inflation was made since the rate was for the POI.

To value factory overhead, we calculated an energy-exclusive percentage based on data from the 1994 edition of *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin* ("RBI"). For selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, we also used 1994 RBI data to calculate SG&A as percentage of materials, labor, energy and factory overhead. For profit, we used 1994 RBI data to calculate a profit as a percentage of materials, labor, energy, factory overhead, and SG&A expenses. We added packing, using Indian values obtained from *Indian Import Statistics*.

Best Information Available (BIA)

The following discussion regarding the application of BIA applies to all exporters other than those that have responded to our questionnaires. Because no information has been presented to the Department to prove otherwise, any exporter of subject merchandise that did not respond to the Department's questionnaires is presumed to be under government control and, therefore, is not entitled to its own separate dumping margin. The evidence on record indicates that the responding companies may not account for all exports of the subject merchandise. In the absence of responses from all exporters, therefore, we are basing the country-wide deposit rate on BIA, pursuant to section 776(c) of the Act (see *Silicon Carbide*).

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 more adverse margins to those respondents that did not cooperate in an investigation. 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 (see *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). In this investigation, since the evidence indicates that not all PRC exporters of manganese sulfate responded to our questionnaire, we are assigning to any PRC company, other than those specifically identified below, the highest margin based on information submitted in the petition, as recalculated by the Department. At initiation, the Department stated that it will carefully reexamine the alleged margins, ranging from 142.25 percent to 801.26 percent, if the use of best information available became an issue in this investigation (see *Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Manganese Sulfate From the People's Republic of China*, (59 FR 66908, December 28, 1994). When applying BIA from the petition, the Department's practice is not to revise the information accepted at initiation, except where the petition includes erroneous or grossly aberrational data (see, e.g., *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China*, 59 FR 55625, November 8, 1994) ("Pencils"). In this instance, the surrogate value cited for ocean freight in the petition appears to be aberrational (e.g., the unit charge for ocean freight deducted from gross unit price equals 68 percent of the gross unit price). Therefore, we reassigned the value for ocean freight based on the highest reported ocean freight charge incurred by a responding company, in this case, CNIEC (see *Calculation Memorandum*). The recalculated petition rate of 211.48 percent applies to all exporters other than those responding exporters that are receiving separate rates.

Critical Circumstances

Petitioners allege that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of manganese sulfate from the PRC. Under 19 CFR 353.16(a), critical circumstances exist if (1) There is a history of dumping in the United States or elsewhere of the class or kind of merchandise which is the subject of this investigation; or the importer knew or should have known that the producer or reseller was selling the merchandise which is the subject of this investigation at less than its fair value; and (2) there have been massive imports of the class or kind of merchandise which is the subject of this investigation over a relatively short period.

In determining whether imports have been massive over a short period of time, 19 CFR 353.16(f) instructs consideration of: (i) The volume and value of the imports; (ii) seasonal trends; and (iii) the share of domestic consumption accounted for by the imports.

Further, 19 CFR 353.16(f)(2) states that imports will not generally be considered massive unless they have increased by at least 15 percent over the imports during the immediately preceding period of comparable duration.

To determine whether the importers of manganese sulfate from the PRC knew, or should have known, that the products were being sold at less than fair value, we considered the company-specific preliminary margins in these investigations. We consider margins of 25 percent or more (when USP is based on PP) and 15 percent (when USP is based on ESP) sufficient to impute knowledge. (See, e.g., *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Argentina* (58 FR 37062, 37078, July 9, 1993)).

For Hunan Chemicals and CNIEC, the margins calculated with respect to manganese sulfate do not exceed 25 percent when USP is based on PP and 15 percent when USP is based on ESP. Accordingly, we must also consider whether there is a history of dumping in the United States or elsewhere with respect to manganese sulfate from the PRC in order to determine whether critical circumstances exist with respect to those companies. We are aware of no outstanding antidumping duty orders with respect to manganese sulfate from the PRC.

In considering the factor of whether there were massive imports over a relatively short period, neither Hunan Chemicals nor CNIEC provided company-specific quantity and value data of monthly exports to the U.S., as requested by the Department. The respondents' failure to provide this information makes it impossible for the Department to accurately evaluate whether the volume of manganese sulfate shipments from the PRC during December 1994 through February 1995 ("post-petition period") exceeded that of August through November 1994 ("pre-petition period").

An analysis of the Department's official import statistics shows that the volume of imports of manganese sulfate that entered the United States from the PRC, under the HTSUS subheading, during the post-petition period (281.158 metric tons) did not exceed that of the pre-petition period (888.292 metric

tons). However, imports of manganese sulfate are reported in a HTSUS basket subheading which includes imports of "other sulfates." Therefore, it is impossible to determine the actual volume of imports of manganese sulfate from the PRC based on this basket subheading, factors related to actual seasonal trends, and the share of domestic consumption. Given the respondents' failure to provide the company-specific monthly data requested by the Department, as BIA, we find that imports of the subject merchandise were massive over a relatively short period of time.

However, based upon our analysis of all the above criteria, we preliminarily determine that critical circumstances do not exist for the two PRC trading companies participating in this investigation.

As regards firms covered by the "PRC-wide" rate, we have used BIA as the basis for determining whether critical circumstances exist for non-respondent exporters. The BIA margin exceeds the threshold for imputing knowledge of dumping to the importers of the merchandise. In addition, we have adversely assumed, as BIA, a massive increase in imports from these non-respondent exporters. We, therefore, determine that critical circumstances exist for non-respondent exporters.

Verification

As provided in section 776(b) of the Act, we will verify all 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 manganese sulfate from the PRC, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 90 days prior to 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 suspensions of liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice. One of the trading companies, CNIEC, will be excepted from these instructions because its sales of subject merchandise supplied by manufacturers Yan Jiang and Xian Lu were found not to have been sold below fair value. CNIEC's sales of subject merchandise supplied by Yan Jiang and Xian Lu will be excluded from an antidumping duty order should one be issued. If CNIEC sells to the United States subject

merchandise supplied from a PRC manufacturer other than Yan Jiang or Xian Lu, such sales will be subject to the "PRC-Wide" rate.

The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin percentage
Hunan Chemicals	8.46
CNIEC/Yan Jiang	00.00
CNIEC/Xian Lu	00.00
CNIEC/Other	212.31
PRC-Wide Rate	212.31

The PRC-Wide rate applies to all entries of subject merchandise except for entries from exporters that are identified above.

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 before the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 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 July 21, 1995, and rebuttal briefs, no later than July 28, 1995. A list of authorities used and a summary of arguments made in the briefs should accompany these briefs. 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 at 10 a.m. on July 31, 1995, at the U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1414, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 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 within 135 days of the publication of the preliminary determination.

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

Dated: May 9, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-12024 Filed 5-15-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

Antidumping Duties

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

ACTION: Notice; Request for public comments on revised antidumping questionnaire.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) has revised its antidumping questionnaire to conform to changes in informational requirements resulting from the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (the URAA). We are now requesting comments on the revised questionnaire. In addition to conforming changes, we will consider other changes to the questionnaire that will simplify and streamline the administration of antidumping proceedings.

DATES: Effective Date: The revised questionnaire is effective May 16, 1995, with respect to petitions for investigations filed and administrative reviews requested on or after January 1, 1995. The Department will consider all written comments concerning the revised antidumping questionnaire received by June 19, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments: Address written comments to Susan G. Esserman, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Central Records Unit, Room B-099, U.S. Department of Commerce, Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20230. Attention: Revised Antidumping Questionnaire Comments. Each person submitting a comment should include his or her name and address, and give reasons for any recommendation.

Questionnaire: The revised antidumping questionnaire is available to the public as of May 16, 1995, on Internet at: FTP://FWUX.FEDWORLD.GOV/PUB/IMPORT or FTP://FTP.FEDWORLD.GOV/PUB/IMPORT/IMPORT.HTM. In addition, the questionnaire is also available on 3.5" diskettes in WordPerfect 5.1 format,

and paper copies are available for reading and photocopying at Room B-099 of the Central Records unit of the Department, Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, NW., Washington DC 20230. Public comments will also be made available on Internet at the same address. These comments may be in a compressed file format. From time to time, the Department may update the questionnaire and request public comments on such revisions. A continuing file of comments on the questionnaire will be maintained in Room B-099 of the Central Records Unit.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
General: Kris Campbell, (202) 482-3813.
Specific: Any questions concerning file formatting, document conversion, access on Internet, or other file requirements should be addressed to Andrew Lee Beller, (202) 482-1248.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department has prepared a revised antidumping questionnaire for use in new investigations and administrative reviews under the statute, as revised by the URAA. To ensure that the revised questionnaire conforms to the changes in the statute, and simplifies and streamlines the administrative process to the fullest extent possible, we are requesting comments from interested persons. To simplify the processing and distribution of public comments on the Department's revised antidumping questionnaire, parties are encouraged to submit documents in electronic form accompanied by one original and three paper copies. All documents filed in electronic form should be on DOS formatted 3.5" diskettes, and be prepared in either WordPerfect format or a format that the WordPerfect program can convert and import into WordPerfect. Comments on diskette should be isolated on a separate file on the diskette by section of the questionnaire (i.e., comments on section A of the questionnaire should be isolated on a file separate from comments on section B, etc.).

Dated: May 11, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-12023 Filed 5-15-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

President's Export Council: Meeting of the Subcommittee on Foreign Market Development, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Amendment to citation 60 FR, page 25200, May 11, 1995, change in location of meeting.

SUMMARY: The meeting of the President's Export Council Subcommittee on Foreign Market Development, Asia, Africa and the Middle East, scheduled for May 17, 1995, from 2 to 5 p.m., will be held at the following address: U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3407, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Linda Breslau, President's Export Council, Room 2015B, Washington, DC 20230, telephone 202-482-1124.

Dated: May 11, 1995.

Jane Siegel,
Staff Director and Executive Secretary, President's Export Council.
[FR Doc. 95-12025 Filed 5-15-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-DR-P

Patent and Trademark Office

[Docket No. 950411100-5100-01]

RIN 0651-XX01

Extension of the Use of Payor Numbers to Matters Involving Pending Patent Applications

AGENCY: Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) requests written public comment on the advisability of the extension of the use of Payor Numbers to matters involving pending patent applications. Payor Numbers are currently used with respect to establishing a "fee address" for receipt of maintenance fee correspondence. The PTO is considering extending the Payor Number practice to matters involving pending patent applications. The use of such Payor Numbers would permit an attorney, agent or law firm to file a single paper containing a change of address, rather than a separate paper for each patent application affected by the change of address. The change of address in multiple patent applications through a single paper directed to the Payor Number would result in savings to both the attorney, agent or law firm and the PTO. Interested members of the