Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, (60 FR 16440, March 30, 1995).

Furthermore, the *Stainless Steel* case cited by AVISMA does not contradict the Department's practice. While AVISMA suggests that it knew or should have known that part of the merchandise was destined for the United States, the record demonstrates that AVISMA was not informed in advance of the destination of the merchandise that it sold to Interlink nor did it have reason to know of the ultimate destination of the merchandise at the time of sale. Interlink, as an international trader of metals, sells titanium sponge to other countries as well as to the United States and titanium sponge specifications are based on world-wide standards in accordance with its expected applications rather than the ultimate destination of the merchandise.

Comment 2

Respondent argues that the Department should review Interlink's sales to the United States because the request for review submitted on behalf of AVISMA, Interlink, and RMI clearly was intended to cover Interlink's sales to the United States during the period of review. Respondent states that the submission on behalf of the three companies requested the Department to conduct a review of ''AVISMA's U.S. sales subject to the antidumping duty order on titanium sponge from Russia.'' Respondent states that since AVISMA is a producer of titanium sponge, Interlink is an exporter of titanium sponge, and RMI is an importer of titanium sponge, the clear intent of the request for review was to seek a review of AVISMA's sales to the United States through the only exporter identified, Interlink. Respondent argues that Interlink, in seeking a review of AVISMA's sales, clearly intended for the Department to review Interlink's shipments and that the Department cannot rationally construe the request for review in any other manner.

Petitioner argues that since AVISMA was the only party for which a review was requested it is the only party the Department is authorized by law to review. Petitioner states that 19 CFR 353.22(a) authorizes the Department to review only those producers or resellers for which it has received a timely request for review. Petitioner states that, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(e)(2), if the Department does not receive a timely request for review of a producer or resellers, antidumping duties are automatically assessed on entries of merchandise not covered by the review request in the amount of the antidumping duties deposited at the time the merchandise entered the United States.

Petitioner states that in this case, the Department received a timely request for review of a specified producer, AVISMA and that therefore, the assessment and deposit rates for all other producers and resellers, including Interlink, are determined by operation of law. Petitioner, citing to *Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from Taiwan,* (56 FR 36130, July 31, 1991), argues that the Department does not, and in the context of an administrative review, it cannot review sales by an unrelated trading company unless it is asked to do so.

Department's Position

We disagree with the respondent. With respect to requests for review, section 353.22(a) of the Department's regulations states that, ''(e)ach year during the anniversary month of the publication of an order * * * an interested party * * * may request * * * an administrative review of *specified* individual producers or *resellers* covered by an order (emphasis added)'.' For those producers or resellers for whom no review is specifically requested, the Department ''will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties * * * on the merchandise not covered by the request.'' 19 C.F.R. § 353.22(e)(2)(1995).

In the instant case, interested parties (*i.e.*, AVISMA, Interlink, RMI, and TIMET) only requested an administrative review of AVISMA's sales, not Interlink's sales. Accordingly, since a review of Interlink's sales was not requested by interested parties, such sales are not covered by this administrative review.

Final Results of Review

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have not changed the final results from those presented in the preliminary results of review. Accordingly, we have determined that, consistent with the preliminary results, the margin for Russian titanium sponge that entered the United States during the period of review will continue to be the rate from the most recent review, which is 83.96 percent. The Department will issue appraisement instruction directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act, the cash deposit rate for all shipments of titanium sponge from Russia, entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, will be 83.96 percent. 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 this 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.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

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

Dated: February 29, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–5596 Filed 3–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Chicago Mercantile Exchange Proposed Rule Amendments To Establish a Globex Foreign Exchange Facility

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rule amendments of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange to establish a Globex Foreign Exchange Facility.

SUMMARY: The Chicago Mercantile Exchange (''CME'' or ''Exchange'') has submitted proposed rule amendments and other materials which would establish a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Exchange which would function as a market maker for certain CME foreign currency futures contracts traded

through the Globex system.[1] Acting pursuant to the authority delegated by Commission Regulation 140.96, the Division of Trading and Markets has determined to publish the CME proposal for public comment. The Division believes that publication of the CME proposal is in the public interest and will assist the Commission in considering the views of interested persons.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 10, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Clarence Sanders, Attorney, Division of Trading and Markets, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW., Washington, DC 20581. Telephone: (202) 418–5484.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Description of Proposed Rule Amendments

A. Purpose

By letters dated January 22, and February 1, 1996, the CME submitted proposed rule amendments pursuant to Section 5a(a)(12)(A) of the Commodity Exchange Act (''Act'') and Commission Regulation 1.41(b). The proposed amendments would establish a Globex Foreign Exchange Facility (''GFF''). Under the proposal, the GFF would function as a market maker for certain CME foreign currency futures contracts traded through the Globex system.[2] The objective of the GFF would be to augment the liquidity of certain Globex foreign currency futures contracts. In so doing, the CME believes that the GFF would help to ensure the presence of relatively liquid markets and narrower bid/ask spread quotations for trading in foreign currency futures contracts through the Globex system.

B. Operation

The GFF would be organized as a wholly-owned subsidiary of the CME. The Exchange would independently capitalize the GFF, thereby providing the GFF with separate financial resources. GFF employees who operate Globex terminals would be subject to all applicable CME rules governing Globex trading. The GFF would be subject to the rules and regulations of the Exchange in the same manner as any other participant conducting transactions on the Exchange.

Operations of the Exchange, as a self-regulatory organization, and the GFF, as a subsidiary entity, would be separated. The GFF would have neither direct nor indirect access to Exchange information on market positions or market exposures of clearing firms and individuals.

The GFF would operate as a market maker during the electronic trading hours (''ETH'') session of the Globex system. GFF trading activities would be confined to trading solely for the account of the GFF. GFF market making operations would be available during two 8¼ hour shifts during the Globex ETH session.

At inception, the GFF would be authorized to make markets in futures contracts for Deutsche marks, Japanese yen, Swiss francs, and British pounds traded through Globex. After a period of time, however, the GFF also would be authorized to make markets in futures contracts in Australian dollars and Canadian dollars traded through Globex.

As a market maker, the GFF would (i) maintain a two-sided market in the form of current bid and ask price quotations and (ii) satisfy bids or offers of other market participants at the GFF's current bid and ask prices. The GFF also would execute transactions through Globex on a Request for Quote (''RFQ'') basis.[3] The GFF would undertake to hedge its Globex-originated positions by executing offsetting transactions in the spot or forward interbank foreign currency market.

Market positions of the GFF would be carried on the books of a CME clearing member firm. Under such an arrangement, the GFF would be a customer of the carrying clearing member firm. The GFF intends to liquidate its Globex-originated futures positions, along with any corresponding interbank positions, during regular trading hours (''RTH''). However, if the GFF did not liquidate all or part of its Globex-originated futures position during RTH, then the GFF would be required to meet performance bond margin requirements at its carrying clearing member firm.

C. Oversight

The CME would establish risk management controls, including the establishment of a GFF Oversight Committee and the appointment of a GFF Risk Manager, to oversee GFF operations. Risk management controls established by the CME would incorporate automated support systems, including systems to track GFF audit trails and performance.

The GFF Oversight Committee would have authority to establish and maintain trading limits, internal controls, and risk management safeguards. The GFF Oversight Committee also would have authority to halt trading operations of the GFF or order liquidation of GFF positions at any time. The GFF Oversight Committee would periodically report to the CME Board of Directors.

The GFF Risk Manager, the CME clearing member firm carrying GFF positions, and CME Clearing House staff would review GFF trading on a daily basis. Other CME staff would have oversight authority to review books, records, systems, and facilities of the GFF. CME staff also would have authority to review GFF trading activity for potential regulatory violations or fraud.

II. Request for Comments

The Commission requests comments on any aspect of the CME's proposed rule amendments that members of the public believe may raise issues under the Act or Commission regulations. In particular, the Commission requests comments regarding the impact on competitive trading conditions; the adequacy of safeguards designed to limit the Exchange's exposure to financial risk; the implications for financial integrity and any consequent need for the segregation of, or limitations on access to, information at the CME and the GFF; the need for safeguards to address potential or actual conflicts of interest arising out of the Exchange's operation of the GFF; the need for restrictions on the personal trading activities of GFF employees; the desirability of segregating GFF positions from the positions of other customers at the clearing member firm carrying the GFF's positions; the determination of appropriate means for assuring that a loss experienced by the GFF would not affect other customers of the clearing member firm carrying the GFF's positions; and whether any other conditions or requirements should be imposed on the proposal.

Copies of the proposed rule amendments and related materials are available for inspection at the Office of the Secretariat, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW, Washington, DC 20581. Copies also may be obtained through the Office of the Secretariat at the above address or by telephoning (202) 418–5100. Some materials may be subject to confidential

[1] The CME proposal includes newly proposed Rule 586.

[2] Globex is an electronic trade execution system for trading in certain of the Exchange's futures and options contracts outside of the CME's regular trading hours. Additionally, certain contracts of the Marché A Terme International de France are listed for trading through Globex.

[3] An RFQ is a Globex system alert by which a Globex user may broadcast a message to all other users requesting a quotation.

treatment pursuant to 17 CFR 145.5 or 145.9.

Any person interested in submitting written data, views, or arguments on the proposed rule amendments should send such comments to Jean A. Webb, Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW, Washington, DC 20581, by the specified date.

Issued in Washington, DC, on February 4, 1996.

Alan L. Seifert,

Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. 96–5606 Filed 3–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) on the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Parcel at Tooele Army Depot, Tooele, Utah

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The proposed action evaluated by this FEIS is the disposal of the 1700 acre BRAC parcel at Tooele Army Depot, Tooele, Utah in accordance with the Defense Base Closure and realignment Act of 1990, Public Law 101–510, as amended.

The FEIS addresses the environmental consequences of the disposal and subsequent reuse of the 1700 acres. Three alternative methods of disposal are analyzed: Encumbered Disposal, Unencumbered Disposal and retention of the property in a caretaker status (i.e., the No Action Alternative). The Encumbered Disposal Alternative addresses natural or man-made encumbrances to the future reuse. The Unencumbered Disposal Alternative evaluates the potential to remove encumbrances, thereby allowing the property to be disposed of with fewer or no Army imposed restrictions on future use. The impacts of reuse are evaluated in terms of land use intensities.

No significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the no action alternative or other disposal alternatives have been identified. The Tooele County Base Reuse Committee submitted a plan for reuse of the BRAC Parcel at Tooele Army Depot. The FEIS acknowledges the Tooele County Base Reuse Committee Reuse Plan as the preferred local reuse plan, and the impacts of that plan are analyzed in the FEIS. Actions associated with realignment of Tooele Army Depot missions are discussed but not analyzed. Reuse of the parcel is analyzed as an indirect or secondary effect of facility disposal. This environmental Impact Statement analyzes potential environmental and socioeconomic consequences of three reuse scenarios. In contradistinction to our finding of no significant impacts with respect to *disposal alternatives*, added demands on limited water resources, traffic, utility system deficiencies and traffic related air pollutant emissions have been identified as potentially significant impacts under one or more of the *reuse alternatives.*

DATES: The public review period for this document ends 30 days after the date of publication of the EPA notice in the Federal Register.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the Final Environmental Impact Statement can be obtained by writing to Mr. Glenn Coffee, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, ATTN: CESAM–PD–E, 109 St. Joseph Street, P.O. Box 2288, Mobile, Alabama 36628–000, telephone (334) 690–2729, telefax (334) 690–2424.1.

Dated: March 5, 1996.

Raymond J. Fatz,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, (Environmental, Safety and Occupational Health) OASA (IL&E).

[FR Doc. 96–5706 Filed 3–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

Defense Logistics Agency

Privacy Act of 1974; Computer Matching Program Between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Defense Manpower Data Center of the Department of Defense.

AGENCY: Defense Manpower Data Center, Defense Logistics Agency, Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of a computer matching program between the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the Department of Defense (DoD) for public comment.

SUMMARY: Subsection (e)(12) of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, (5 U.S.C. 552a) requires agencies to publish advance notice of any proposed or revised computer matching program by the matching agency for public comment. The DoD, as the matching agency under the Privacy Act is hereby giving notice to the record subjects of a computer matching program between VA and DoD that their records are being matched by computer. The purpose of this match is to identify disability compensation recipients who return to active duty to insure benefits are adjusted or terminated, if appropriate, and steps taken to collect any resulting overpayment.

DATES: This proposed action will become effective April 10, 1996, and the computer matching will proceed accordingly without further notice, unless comments are received which would result in a contrary determination or if the Office of Management and Budget or Congress objects thereto. Any public comment must be received before the effective date.

ADDRESSES: Any interested party may submit written comments to the Director, Defense Privacy Office, Crystal Mall 4, Room 920, 1941 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202–4502.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Aurelio Nepa, Jr. at telephone (703) 607–2943.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to subsection (o) of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, (5 U.S.C. 552a), the DMDC and VA have concluded an agreement to conduct a computer matching program between the agencies. The purpose of the match is to exchange personal data between the agencies to identify disability compensation recipients who have returned to active duty and are therefore ineligible to receive VA compensation.

The parties to this agreement have determined that a computer matching program is the most efficient, expeditious, and effective means of obtaining and processing the information needed by the VA to identify ineligible VA disability compensation recipients who have returned to active duty. Using the computer matching program, information on successful matches (hits) can be provided to VA within 90 days of receipt of a magnetic tape of VA benefits record data. A computer match is the most efficient method, other than a manual search of all active duty military personnel records, to identify such cases if an individual does not report his/her own return to active duty.

A copy of the computer matching agreement between VA and DMDC is available upon request to the public. Requests should be submitted to the address caption above or to the Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Benefit Administration, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20420.

Set forth below is the notice of the establishment of a computer matching program required by paragraph 6.c. of the Office of Management and Budget Guidelines on computer matching