

Trade Zone 103, Grand Forks, North Dakota, for reissuance of the grant of authority for said zone to the Grand Forks Regional Airport Authority, a North Dakota public corporation, which has accepted such reissuance subject to approval of the FTZ Board, the Board, finding that the requirements of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended, and the Board's regulations are satisfied, and that the proposal is in the public interest, approves the request and recognizes the Grand Forks Regional Airport Authority as the new grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 103, Grand Forks, North Dakota.

The approval is subject to the FTZ Act and the FTZ Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 5th day of July 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

[FR Doc. 95-17229 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[Order No. 756]

Grant of Authority for Subzone Status; Siemens Industrial Automation, Inc. (Industrial Automation Products), Carter County, Tennessee

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, by an Act of Congress approved June 18, 1934, an Act "To provide for the establishment * * * of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes," as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u) (the Act), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) is authorized to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs ports of entry;

Whereas, the Board's regulations (15 CFR Part 400) provide for the establishment of special-purpose subzones when existing zone facilities cannot serve the specific use involved;

Whereas, an application from the Tri-City Airport Commission, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 204, for authority to establish special-purpose subzone status at the industrial automation products distribution/manufacturing facility of Siemens Industrial Automation, Inc., in Carter County, Tennessee, was filed by the Board on May 10, 1994, and notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (FTZ Docket 19-94, 59 FR 25885, 5-18-94) (amended, 3-23-95, 60 FR 16604, 3-31-95); and,

Whereas, the Board has found that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations are satisfied, and that approval of the application, as amended, is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby authorizes the establishment of a subzone (Subzone 204A) at the plant site of Siemens Industrial Automation, Inc., in Carter County, Tennessee, at the location described in the application, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 5th day of July 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

[FR Doc. 95-17230 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[Order No. 753]

Revision of Grant of Authority Subzone 122L; Koch Refining Company (Oil Refinery), Corpus Christi, Texas

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) authorized subzone status at the refinery complex of Koch Refining Company in Corpus Christi, Texas, in 1991, subject to two conditions (Subzone 122L, Board Order 535, 56 FR 43905, 9/5/91);

Whereas, the Port of Corpus Christi Authority, grantee of FTZ 122, has requested pursuant to § 400.32(b)(1)(i), a revision (filed 5/8/95, A(32b1)-6-95; FTZ Doc. 31-95, assigned 6/16/95) of the grant of authority for FTZ Subzone 122L which would make its scope of authority identical to that recently granted for FTZ Subzone 199A at the refinery complex of Amoco Oil Company, Texas City, Texas (Board Order 731, 60 FR 13118, 3/10/95); and,

Whereas, the request has been reviewed and the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, acting for the Board pursuant to § 400.32(b)(1), concurs in the recommendation of the Executive Secretary, and approves the request;

Now Therefore, the Board hereby orders that, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28, Board Order 535 is revised to replace the two conditions currently listed in the Order with the following conditions:

1. Foreign status (19 CFR 146.41, 146.42) products consumed as fuel for

the refinery shall be subject to the applicable duty rate.

2. Privileged foreign status (19 CFR 146.41) shall be elected on all foreign merchandise admitted to the subzone, except that non-privileged foreign (NPF) status (19 CFR 146.42) may be elected on refinery inputs covered under HTSUS Subheadings # 2709.00.1000-# 2710.00.1050 and # 2710.00.2500 which are used in the production of:
— Petrochemical feedstocks and refinery by-products (FTZ staff report, Appendix B);
— Products for export; and,
— Products eligible for entry under HTSUS # 9808.00.30 and 9808.00.40 (U.S. Government purchases).

3. The authority with regard to the NPF option is initially granted until September 30, 2000, subject to extension.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 5th day of July 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

[FR Doc. 95-17228 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

International Trade Administration

[A-428-816]

Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Germany: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by one respondent, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Germany (A-428-816). This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review (POR) February 4, 1993, through July 31, 1994.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below the foreign market value (FMV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States price (USP) and the FMV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 13, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Decker, Bruce Harsh or Linda Ludwig, Office of Agreements Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-3793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

Background

On July 9, 1993, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (58 FR 37136) the final affirmative antidumping duty determination on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Germany, for which we published an antidumping duty order on August 19, 1993 (58 FR 44170). On August 3, 1994, the Department published the notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of this order for the period February 4, 1993, through July 31, 1994 (59 FR 39543). The respondent, AG der Dillinger Hüttenwerke (Dillinger), requested an administrative review. We initiated the review on September 8, 1994 (59 FR 46391). The Department is conducting this review, in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this administrative review constitute one "class or kind" of merchandise: certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate. These products include hot-rolled carbon steel universal mill plates (i.e., flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 millimeters but not exceeding 1,250 millimeters and of a thickness of not less than 4 millimeters, not in coils and without patterns in relief), of rectangular shape, neither clad, plated nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances; and certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat-rolled products in straight lengths, of rectangular shape, hot rolled, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, 4.75 millimeters or more in thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters

and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) under item numbers 7208.31.0000, 7208.32.0000, 7208.33.1000, 7208.33.5000, 7208.41.0000, 7208.42.0000, 7208.43.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.11.0000, 7211.12.0000, 7211.21.0000, 7211.22.0045, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, and 7212.50.0000. Included are flat-rolled products of nonrectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (i.e., products which have been—"worked after rolling")—for example, products which have been bevelled or rounded at the edges. Excluded is grade X-70 plate. These HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The POR is February 4, 1993, through July 31, 1994. This review covers sales of certain cut-to-length plate by Dillinger.

United States Price

All of Dillinger's U.S. sales were based on the price to the first unrelated purchaser in the United States. The Department determined that purchase price, as defined in section 772 of the Tariff Act, was the appropriate basis for calculating USP. All sales were made through Francosteel, a related sales agent in the United States, to unrelated purchasers. Whenever sales are made prior to the date of importation through a related sales agent in the United States, we typically determine that purchase price is the most appropriate determinant of the USP based upon the following factors: (1) The merchandise in question was shipped directly from the manufacturer to the unrelated buyer, without being introduced into the inventory of the related shipping agent; (2) direct shipment from the manufacturer to the unrelated buyers was the customary commercial channel for sales of this merchandise between the parties involved; and (3) the related selling agent in the United States acted only as a processor of sales-related documentation and a communication link with the unrelated U.S. buyers. See Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods from France: Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value, 58 FR 68865, 68868 (December 29, 1993); Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Japan: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 58 FR 50343, 50344 (September 27, 1993). In the present review, we found that: the essential terms of sale were set prior to

importation; the merchandise was shipped immediately to the customer upon importation into the United States, without being introduced into the inventory of the related shipping agent; direct shipment from the manufacturer to the unrelated buyers was the customary commercial channel for sales of this merchandise; the merchandise was not warehoused by Francosteel during the normal course of business; and the related selling agent in the United States acted only as a processor of sales-related documentation and a communication link with the unrelated U.S. buyers. We made adjustments to purchase price, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. and foreign brokerage and handling, U.S. duty, and U.S. inland freight.

We also adjusted USP for taxes in accordance with our practice as outlined in various determinations, including Silicomanganese from Venezuela; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, 59 FR 55435, 55439 (November 7, 1994). No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

Foreign Market Value

Based on a comparison of the volume of home market and third country sales, we determined that the home market was viable. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act, we based FMV on the packed, delivered price to unrelated purchasers in the home market, using date of shipment as date of sale (see Analysis Memorandum to the File, May 25, 1995).

Based on a review of Dillinger's submissions, the Department determined that only a small percentage of Dillinger's U.S. sales were the same grades of steel as the home market sales made by Dillinger's related parties to the first unrelated party (downstream sales). Accordingly, the Department determined that Dillinger need not report its home market downstream sales because they could provide potential matches to only a very small portion of the company's reported U.S. sales.

Based on the Department's previous determination of sales made at below the cost of production (COP) in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, in accordance with section 773(b) of the Tariff Act, we determined that there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that, for this review period, Dillinger made sales of subject merchandise in the home market at prices less than the COP. As a result, we investigated whether Dillinger sold such or similar

merchandise in the home market at prices below the COP. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.51(c), we calculated COP for Dillinger as the sum of reported materials, labor, factory overhead, and general expenses. We compared COP to home market prices, net of price adjustments, discounts, and movement expenses.

In accordance with section 773(b) of the Tariff Act, in determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined whether such sales were made in substantial quantities over an extended period of time, and whether such sales were made at prices which permitted recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade.

In accordance with our normal practice, for each model for which less than 10 percent, by quantity, of the home market sales during the POR were made at prices below COP, we included all sales of that model in the computation of FMV. For each model for which 10 percent or more, but less than 90 percent, of the home market sales during the POR were priced below COP, we excluded those sales priced below COP, provided that they were made over an extended period of time. For each model for which 90 percent or more of the home market sales during the POR were priced below COP and were made over an extended period of time, we disregarded all sales of that model in our calculation and, in accordance with section 773(b) of the Tariff Act, we used the constructed value (CV) of those models, as described below. See, e.g., Mechanical Transfer Presses from Japan, Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 59 FR 9958 (March 2, 1994).

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Tariff Act, to determine whether sales below cost had been made over an extended period of time, we compared the number of months in which sales below cost occurred for a particular model to the number of months in which that model was sold. If the model was sold in fewer than three months, we did not disregard below-cost sales unless there were below-cost sales of that model in each month sold. If a model was sold in three or more months, we did not disregard below-cost sales unless there were sales below cost in at least three of the months in which the model was sold. We used CV as the basis for FMV when an insufficient number of home market sales were made at prices above COP. See Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four

Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, From Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, 58 FR 64720, 64729 (December 8, 1993).

Because Dillinger provided no indication that its below-cost sales of models within the "greater than 90 percent" and the "between 10 and 90 percent" categories were at prices that would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time and in the normal course of trade, we disregarded those sales of models within the "10 to 90 percent" category which were made below cost over an extended period of time. In addition, as a result of our COP test for home market sales of models within the "greater than 90 percent" category, we based FMV on CV for all U.S. sales for which there were insufficient sales of the comparison home market model at or above COP. Finally, where we found, for certain of Dillinger's models, home market sales for which less than 10 percent were made below COP, we used all home market sales of these models in our comparisons.

We also used CV as FMV for those U.S. sales for which there was no sale of such or similar merchandise in the home market. We calculated CV in accordance with section 773(e) of the Tariff Act. We included the cost of materials, labor, and factory overhead in our calculations. Where the general expenses were less than the statutory minimum of 10 percent of the cost of manufacture (COM), we calculated general expenses as 10 percent of the COM. Where the actual profits were less than the statutory minimum of 8 percent of the COM plus general expenses, we calculated profit as 8 percent of the sum of COM plus general expenses. Based on our verification of Dillinger's cost response, we adjusted Dillinger's reported COP and CV to reflect certain adjustments to the cost of manufacturing, general and administrative expenses, indirect selling expenses and the calculation of profit.

In accordance with section 773 of the Tariff Act, for those U.S. models for which we were able to find a home market such or similar match that had sufficient above-cost sales, we calculated FMV based on the packed, F.O.B., ex-factory, or delivered prices to unrelated purchasers in the home market. We made adjustments, where applicable, for post-sale inland freight, and for home market direct expenses, such as certain rebates tied to specific sales, credit and discounts. In addition, we adjusted FMV for differences in physical characteristics, U.S. direct selling expenses, and the German value-

added tax. Also, after deducting home market packing, we added packing expenses incurred in Germany for U.S. sales to FMV. No adjustment was made for home market related party commissions because Dillinger did not demonstrate that these commissions were at arm's length, but we offset an addition to FMV for U.S. commissions with home market indirect selling expenses.

Due to discrepancies in Dillinger's reporting of certain customers and level of trade, we are not in a position to know which sales reported as end-user sales were in fact end-user sales and which were sales to service centers/distributors. The only known difference in terms of sale to service centers/distributors and end-users was that service centers/distributors received a trader discount. Consequently, in matching home market sales to sales to U.S. end-users, we adjusted FMV to account for this discount (see Analysis Memorandum to the File, May 25, 1995).

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our comparison of USP to FMV we preliminarily determine that the following margin exists for the period February 4, 1993, through July 31, 1994:

Manufacturer	Margin
Dillinger	2.02%

Interested parties may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice and may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication or the first business day thereafter. Case briefs and/or written comments from interested parties may be submitted no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in those comments, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department will publish the final results of these administrative reviews including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between the USP and FMV may vary from the percentages stated above.

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 the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act. A cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties shall be required on shipments of certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Germany as follows: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original LTFV investigation, 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) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review, the cash deposit rate will be 36.00 percent. This is the "all others" rate from the LTFV investigation. See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Germany, 58 FR 37136 (July 9, 1993).

This notice also serves as a preliminary 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 this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: July 6, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-17227 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings Nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations

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

ACTION: Determination not to revoke
antidumping duty orders and findings

nor to terminate suspended
investigations.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is notifying the public of its determination not to revoke the antidumping duty orders and findings nor to terminate the suspended investigations listed below.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 13, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Panfeld or the analyst listed under Antidumping Proceeding at: Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 482-4737.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Commerce (the Department) may revoke an antidumping duty order or finding or terminate a suspended investigation, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(d)(4)(iii), if no interested party has requested an administrative review for four consecutive annual anniversary months and no domestic interested party objects to the revocation or requests an administrative review.

We had not received a request to conduct an administrative review for the most recent four consecutive annual anniversary months. Therefore, pursuant to § 353.25(d)(4)(i) of the Department's regulations, on April 28, 1995, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice of intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations and served written notice of the intent to each domestic interested party on the Department's service list in each case. Within the specified time frame, we received objections from domestic interested parties to our intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations. Therefore, because domestic interested parties objected to our intent to revoke or terminate, we no longer intend to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings or to terminate the suspended investigations.

Antidumping Proceeding

A-357-802

Argentina
Rectangular Carbon Steel Tubing
Objection Date: May 26, 1995
Objector: Hannibal Industries, Inc.
Contact: Sally Hastings at (202) 482-4366

A-351-503

Brazil
Iron Construction Castings

Objection Date: May 9, 1995
Objector: East Jordan Iron Works, Inc.
Contact: Hermes Pinilla at (202) 482-3477

A-588-066

Japan
Impression Fabric
Objection Date: May 30, 1995
Objector: Bomont Industries
Contact: Joe Fargo at (202) 482-5345

A-580-507

South Korea
Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings,
Other than Grooved
Objection Date: May 19, 1995
Objector: Grinnell Corporation, Ward
Manufacturing, Inc., and Stockham
Valves & Fittings Co., Inc.
Contact: Thomas Schauer at (202)
482-4852

A-583-507

Taiwan
Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings,
Other Than Grooved
Objection Date: May 19, 1995
Objector: Grinnell Corporation, Ward
Manufacturing Inc., Stockham
Valves & Fittings Co., Inc.
Contact: Wendy J. Frankel at (202)
482-0367

Dated: June 30, 1995.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.
[FR Doc. 95-17231 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Public Information Collection Requirement Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Review

ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Title: TRICARE Enrollment
Application Form.

Type of Request: Expedited
Processing—Approval date requested:
30 days following publication in the
Federal Register.

Number of Respondents: 300,000.

Responses Per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 300,000.

Average Burden Per Response: 15
minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 75,000.

Needs and Uses: The collection
instrument serves as an application
form for enrollment in the TRICARE
Health Care Delivery Program
established in accordance with 10 USC