duties, and border crossing charges paid for mature green, vine ripe, and plum tomatoes of various sizes imported from Mexico through Nogales, Arizona. The petitioners made deductions to export price for movement expenses and commissions. They provided additional export price calculations incorporating adjustments for ''backbilling'' (post-sale price protection adjustments), quality mix differentials, and price ''overstatements'' based on differences between USDA data and Bureau of Census import statistics.

The petitioners based normal value on wholesale prices for vine ripe and plum tomatoes from several wholesale markets in Mexico, as published by the USDA marketing service. The petitioners made adjustments to home market prices for wholesaler markups, commissions, and movement expenses.

To calculate monthly normal values for comparisons to monthly export prices, the petitioners based normal value on both home market prices and constructed value (CV) because, in accordance with Section 773(b)(2) of the Act, the petitioners alleged that some sales of fresh tomatoes in the home market were made at prices below the cost of production (COP), and therefore are not an appropriate basis for calculating normal value.

The petitioners calculated COP using data derived from cost studies of vine-ripe tomato production in Mexico prepared by the USDA, which relied on cost studies reported by an association of Mexican tomato producers. Where appropriate, the petitioners adjusted the cost data for inflation, changes in interest rates, and currency conversion. We adjusted the petitioners' COP by correcting the deduction for selling expenses.

The allegation that the Mexican producers are selling the foreign like product in the home market at prices below its COP is based upon a comparison of the adjusted home market prices with the calculated COP. Based on this comparison, we find reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product were made at prices below COP in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act. Accordingly, the Department is initiating a country-wide cost investigation.

Therefore, for the purposes of this initiation, we are accepting CV as the appropriate basis for Mexican normal value for those petition margin examples where the petitioners claimed that there are no above-cost sales in the home market. The petitioners based CV on its COP methodology, described above, deducting commission and export transportation expenses included in these costs, and adding an amount for profit to derive a total CV. The petitioners calculated profit based on above-cost Mexican market prices. We revised CV by incorporating the correction to selling expenses deducted from COP. We also recalculated the profit amount used in CV based on a revised database of above cost sales in the home market.

Based on comparisons of export prices, with deductions for backbilling adjustments and ''price overstatements,'' to normal value (with CV revised as discussed above), the petitioners allege margins of 12.86 percent to 273.42 percent.

Fair Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by the petitioners, there is reason to believe that imports of fresh tomatoes from Mexico are being, or are likely to be, sold at less than fair value. If it becomes necessary at a later date to consider the petition as a source of facts available under section 776 of the Act, we may further review the margin calculations in the petition.

Initiation of Investigation

We have examined the petition on fresh tomatoes and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act, including the requirements concerning allegations of material injury or threat of material injury to the domestic producers of a domestic like product by reason of the complained-of imports, allegedly sold at less than fair value. Therefore, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of fresh tomatoes from Mexico are being, or are likely to be, sold at less than fair value. Unless extended, we will make our preliminary determination by September 5, 1996.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of the petition has been provided to the representatives of the Government of Mexico. Because of the large number of exporters, we will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the petition to the relevant trade associations representing exporters of fresh tomatoes named in the petition.

International Trade Commission (ITC) Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will determine by May 16, 1996, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of fresh tomatoes from Mexico are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated; otherwise, the investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Dated: April 18, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–10112 Filed 4–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) has received requests to conduct administrative reviews of various antidumping and countervailing duty orders and findings with March anniversary dates. In accordance with the Department's regulations, we are initiating those administrative reviews. The Department also received requests to revoke one antidumping duty order in part.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 25, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Holly A. Kuga, 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) 482–4737.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department has received timely requests, in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 353.22(a) and 355.22(a)(1994), for administrative reviews of various antidumping and countervailing duty orders and findings with March anniversary dates. The Department also received timely requests to revoke in part the antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from Korea.

Initiation of Reviews

In accordance with sections 19 CFR 353.22(c) and 355.22(c), we are initiating administrative reviews of the following antidumping and countervailing duty orders and findings. The Department is not initiating an administrative review of any exporters and/or producers who were not named in a review request because such exporters and/or producers were not specified as required under section 353.22(a) and 355.22(a)(19 CFR 353.22(a) and 355.22(a)). We intend to issue the final results of these reviews not later than March 31, 1997.

	Period to be reviewed
Antidumping Duty Proceedings:	
Brazil: Ferrosilicon, A–351–820—Companhia Ferroligas Minas Gerais-Minasligas	3/1/95–2/29/96
South Korea: Steel Wire Rope, A–580–811—Boo Kook Corporation, Chun Kee Steel & Wire Rope Co., Ltd., Chung Woo Rope Co., Ltd., Dong-Il Steel Mfg. Co., Ltd., Hanboo Wire Rope, Inc., Kumho Rope, Manho Rope Mfg. Co., Ltd., Myung Jin Co., Seo Jin Rope, Ssang Yong Steel Wire Co., Ltd., Sung Jin Yeonsin Metal	3/1/95–2/29/96
Spain: Stainless Steel Bar, A–469–805—Roldan, S.A.	8/4/94–2/29/96
Thailand: Circular Welded Pipes & Tubes, A–549–502—Saha Thai Steel Pipe Co., Ltd., S.A.F. Pipe Export Co., Ltd., Thai Union Steel Co., Ltd.,	3/1/95–2/29/96
The People's Republic of China: Axes/Adzes; Bars/Wedges; Hammers/Sledges; and Picks/Mattocks, A–570–803—Tianjin Machinery Import & Export Company [1]	2/1/95–1/31/96
United Kingdom: Lead & Bismuth Steel, A–412–810—British Steel Engineering Steels, Ltd., British Steel Engineering Steels Holdings, Ltd., British Steel plc	3/1/95–2/29/96
Countervailing Duty Proceedings:	
Pakistan: Shop Towels, C–535–001—Anwar Corporation, Bita Textile Corporation, Eastern Textiles (Pvt) Ltd., Fine Fabrico, Hilal Corporation (Pvt) Ltd, Jawad Brothers, Mehtabi Towel Mills (Pvt) Ltd., Mohain Brothers, Pakistan Textile Corporation (Pvt) Ltd., Quality Linen Supply Corporation, Salimah International, Shaheen Textiles, Shahi Textiles, Sultex Industries, The Khans, United Towel Exporters	1/1/95–12/31/95
Turkey: Welded Carbon Steel Line Pipe and Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes, C–489–502—Borusan Birlesik Boru Fab. A.S., Borusan Ihracat Ithalat ve Dagitim A.S., Erbosan Erciyas Boru Sanayii ve Ticaret A.s., Mannesman-Sumerbank Boru Endustrisi T.A.S.	1/1/95–12/31/95
United Kingdom: Lead & Bismuth Steel, C–412–811—British Steel Engineering Steels Ltd., British Steel Engineering Steels Holdings Ltd., British Steel plc	1/1/95–12/31/95

[1] Inadvertently omitted from previous initiation notice.

If requested within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice, the Department will determine whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to any of these reviews if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer which is affiliated with such exporter or producer.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(b) and 355.34(b).

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 353.22(c)(1) and 355.22(c)(1).

Dated: April 19, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–10277 Filed 4–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 32–96]

Foreign-Trade Zone 31—Granite City, Illinois; Application for Subzone Status; Shell Oil Company (Oil Refinery Complex); Madison County, Illinois

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the Tri-City Port District, grantee of FTZ 31, requesting special-purpose subzone status for the oil refinery complex of Shell Oil Company, located in Madison County, Illinois. 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 April 17, 1996.

The refinery complex (1,922 acres, 1,100 employees) consists of 3 sites and related pipelines in Madison County, Illinois, some 25 miles east of St. Louis, Missouri: *Site 1* (1533 acres)—main refinery complex (290,000 BPD) located at Hwy 111 in Wood River Township, including areas located in the towns of Roxana, Hartford, South Roxana and Wood River; *Site 2* (289 acres)—crude oil storage facility (3.2 mil. barrel capacity) located across Hwy 111 from the refinery, and; *Site 3* (100 acres)—sulfur recovery plant located adjacent to the refinery.

The refinery complex is used to produce fuels and petrochemical feedstocks. Fuels produced include gasoline, jet fuel, distillates, diesel, and residual fuels. Petrochemical feedstocks and refinery by-products may include methane, ethane, propane, butane, butylene, toluene, propylene, paraffin wax, carbon black oil, cumene, sulfur and petroleum coke. About 60 percent of the crude oil and related products (e.g., condensate) (90 percent of inputs), and some feedstocks and motor fuel blendstocks used in producing fuel products are sourced abroad.

Zone procedures would exempt the activity from Customs duty payments on the foreign products used in its exports. On domestic sales, the company would be able to choose the finished product duty rate (nonprivileged foreign status—NPF) on certain petrochemical feedstocks and refinery by-products (duty-free) instead of the duty rates that would otherwise apply to the foreign-sourced inputs (e.g., crude oil). The duty rates on crude oil and condensate range from 5.25¢/barrel to 10.5¢/barrel. The application indicates that the savings from zone procedures would help improve the refinery's international competitiveness.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff