discuss civil rights progress and/or problems in the State, discuss the status of the Commission and the Advisory Committees, report on the Chairpersons conference held in June, and provide updates on a report on racial tensions and on the Title VI project.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Committee Chairperson Jocelyn Wurzburg, 901–684–1332, or Bobby D. Doctor, Director of the Southern Regional Office, 404–730–2476 (TDD 404–730–2481). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least five (5) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, August 9, 1995.

Carol-Lee Hurley,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 95–20332 Filed 8–16–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the Tennessee Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the Tennessee Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene at 10 a.m. and adjourn at 5 p.m. on Thursday, September 14, 1995, at the City County Building, Small Assembly Room, 400 Main Avenue, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902. The purpose of the meeting is to hear presentations from local government and business representatives on Title VI enforcement in Tennessee.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Committee Chairperson Jocelyn Wurzburg, 901–684–1332, or Bobby D. Doctor, Director of the Southern Regional Office, 404–730–2476 (TDD 404–730–2481). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least five (5) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, August 9, 1995.

Carol-Lee Hurley,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 95–20333 Filed 8–16–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the Vermont Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the Vermont Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene at 1:00 p.m. and adjourn at 5:00 p.m. on Friday, September 15, 1995, Ramada Inn and Conference Center, 1117 Williston Road, Burlington, Vermont 05403. The purpose of the meeting is to plan a project activity for fiscal year 1996.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Committee Chairperson Dr. Samuel Hand, 802–656–3180, or Edward Darden, Acting Director of the Eastern Regional Office, 202–376–7533 (TDD 202–376–8116). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least five (5) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, August 9, 1995.

Carol-Lee Hurley,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 95–20334 Filed 8–16–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the Virginia Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the Virginia Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene at 9:30 a.m. and adjourn at 12:30 p.m. on Wednesday, September 13, 1995, at the Richmond Marriott, 500 East Broad Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss issues associated with the upcoming factfinding meeting addressing civil rights in the Tidewater area.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Committee Chairperson Jessie M. Rattley, 804–727–5647, or Edward Darden, Acting Director of the Eastern Regional Office, 202–376–7533 (TDD 202–376–8116). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least five (5) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, August 9, 1995.

Carol-Lee Hurley,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 95–20335 Filed 8–16–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 42–95]

Foreign-Trade Zone 54, Clinton County, New York; Application for Expansion

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the Clinton County Area Development Corporation, on behalf of Clinton County, New York, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 54, requesting authority to expand its zone in the Clinton County, New York, area, within the Champlain Customs port of entry. The application was submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR Part 400). It was formally filed on August 9, 1995.

FTZ 54 was approved on February 14, 1980 (Board Order 153, 45 FR 12469) and expanded on September 23, 1982 (Board Order 196, 47 FR 43102). The zone project currently includes 2 general-purpose sites: *Site 1* (123 acres)—Clinton County Air Industrial Park, Plattsburgh; and, *Site 2* (11 acres)—One Trans-Border Drive, Champlain, at I–87 and U.S. Rt. 11.

The applicant is now requesting authority to further expand the general-purpose zone to include an additional site (proposed *Site 3*)—Champlain Industrial Park (200 acres). The park, which is being developed by the applicant, is located on New York State Route 11 in Champlain, New York.

No specific manufacturing requests are being made at this time. Such requests would be made to the Board on a case-by-case-basis.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to

investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment on the application is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is October 16, 1995. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to October 31, 1995).

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at each of the following locations:

Clinton County Area Development Corp., 61 Area Development Drive, Plattsburgh, New York 12901

Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 3716, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230

Dated: August 11, 1995.

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–20438 Filed 8–16–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

International Trade Administration

[A–580–807]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On July 8, 1994, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip from the Republic of Korea. The review covers four manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States for the period November 30, 1990 through May 31, 1992.

As a result of comments we received, the antidumping margins have changed from those we presented in our preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 17, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy F. Unger, Jr., or Thomas F. Futtner, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–0651/3814.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 8, 1994, the Department published the preliminary results (59 FR 35098) of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate (PET) film from the Republic of Korea (56 FR 25660, June 5, 1991). At the request of petitioners and one respondent, we held a hearing on September 2, 1994.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip, whether extruded or coextruded. The films excluded from this review are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches (0.254 micrometers) thick. Roller transport cleaning film which has at least one of its surfaces modified by the application of 0.5 micrometers of SBR latex has also been ruled as not within the scope of the order.

PET film is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheading 3920.62.00.00. The HTS subheading is provided for convenience and for U.S. Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage. For most of the respondents the period of review (POR) covers November 30, 1990 through May 31, 1992. Because Cheil was determined to have a *de minimis* margin in the *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value* (56 FR 16305) (LTFV), Cheil's POR begins on April 22, 1991, when suspension of its merchandise was first ordered, and runs through May 31, 1992. The Department has conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Analysis of Comments Received

We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results of this administrative review. At the request of petitioners and one respondent, we held a public hearing on September 2, 1994. We received timely comments from petitioners and all respondents.

General Comments

Comment 1

Petitioners argue that respondents' reported costs for recycled PET film chip or pellet are not accurate and understate the true costs of producing PET film from recycled or reclaimed chip. Petitioners argue that respondents' cost accounting methodologies for recycled PET pellet are inconsistent with the Federal Circuit decision in *IPSCO v. United States*, 965 F.2d 1056, 1059–1061 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (*Ipsco Appeal*).

Petitioners have also argued that respondents' cost methodology for recycled PET chips permits possible manipulation of product costs to the advantage of respondents. Petitioners allege that this could occur by respondents' use of fewer recycled chips to produce film types that are not comparison candidates in the administrative review and more recycled chips to produce film types destined for the U.S. market and those comparable to the U.S.-destined merchandise. Under this scenario, according to petitioners, the low cost of recycled PET chips relative to virgin chips would reduce the cost of the U.S. product and its home market comparator. Petitioners allege that such cost shifting would reduce the probability of finding sales in the home market at prices below the cost of production (COP) and, where no contemporaneous sales of such or similar merchandise are available for comparison, use of lower constructed values.

In addition, petitioners allege that Cheil's use of the net realizable value for recycled PET chips is inaccurate because the market for recycled PET chips is not a real or significant market. Petitioners contend that very little recycled PET chip is sold on the open market and that it is not sold for use in PET film production.

Petitioners argue that respondents violated the *Ipsco Appeal* decision which requires that the total actual cost of merchandise subject to an antidumping duty order be included in the reported cost of such merchandise. Specifically, petitioners claim that respondents' reported costs do not capture the costs of production using recycled chip for the following reasons:

Cheil: Petitioners assert that Cheil's reported cost of recycled chip on the net realizable value (NRV) of PET pellets is inconsistent with Korean GAAP. Moreover, petitioners argue, this method results in the understatement of the true cost of recycled chip. Petitioners argue that Cheil should base