

Sunshine Act Meeting

July 1, 1996.

DATE AND TIME: Friday, July 12, 1996, 9:30 a.m.

PLACE: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 624 Ninth Street, NW, Room 540, Washington, DC 20425.

STATUS:

Agenda

- I. Approval of Agenda
- II. Approval of Minutes of June 14, 1996 Meeting
- III. Announcements
- IV. Staff Director's Report
- V. Continuation of General Programmatic Theme Discussion
- VI. State Advisory Committee Report

"The Enforcement of Affirmative Action Compliance in Indiana Under Executive Order 11246" (Indiana)

VII. Future Agenda Items

11:00 a.m. Briefing on Three Strikes and You're Out—Mandatory Life Sentences After Three Felony Convictions

CONTACT PERSON FOR FURTHER

INFORMATION: Barbara Brooks, Press and Communications (202) 376-8312.

Miguel A. Sapp,
Parliamentarian.

[FR Doc. 96-17268 Filed 7-2-96; 2:10 pm]

BILLING CODE 6335-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[A-580-807]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Notice of Revocation in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Notice of Revocation in Part.

SUMMARY: On September 29, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of administrative reviews and notice of intent to revoke in part the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate (PET) film, sheet, and strip from the Republic of Korea. The reviews cover four manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States and the periods June 1, 1992 through May

31, 1993 and June 1, 1993 through May 31, 1994.

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

EFFECTIVE DATES: July 5, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael J. Heaney, or John Kugelman, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-4475/0649.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

On September 29, 1995 (59 FR 50547), the Department published the preliminary results of administrative reviews and notice of intent to revoke in part the antidumping duty order on PET film from the Republic of Korea (56 FR 25669, June 5, 1991). At the request of petitioners and three respondents, we held a hearing on April 9, 1996.

These reviews cover four manufacturer/exporters: Cheil Synthetics, Inc. (Cheil), Kolon Industries (Kolon), SKC Limited (SKC), and STC Corporation (STC).

We are revoking the order for Cheil because Cheil has sold the subject merchandise at not less than foreign market value (FMV) in these reviews and for at least three consecutive periods. Cheil has also submitted certification that it will not sell at less than FMV in the future.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by these reviews 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.

The reviews cover the periods June 1, 1992 through May 31, 1993 (second review period) and June 1, 1993 through May 31, 1994 (third review period). The Department has conducted these reviews in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

Analysis of Comments Received

We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results of this administrative review. We received timely comments from the petitioners and all four respondents. At the request of the petitioners and three respondents, we held a public hearing on April 9, 1996.

Comment 1: Petitioners argue generally that the methodologies employed by SKC and Cheil to value recycled chip (RC) assign an unreasonably low cost to recycled resin. Petitioners contend that the cost of processing recycled film is directly associated with the cost of the chemicals which are reclaimed. Petitioners assert that to properly account for the cost of producing PET film, the Department must include both the cost of the materials content of the recycled film and the cost of the recycling. Petitioners also argue that both virgin resin and recycled resin contain the same basic chemicals in the same quantities, and that recycled resin is a nearly "one for one" substitute for virgin resin. Petitioners assert that the differences between virgin resin and recycled resin are "minimal." While limits exist on the amount of recycled resin that can be used in PET film production, petitioners note that in many instances recycled resin accounts for more than 50 percent of the raw material inputs. Petitioners further note that the bill of materials ("recipes") for PET films can be adjusted to tolerate a greater or lesser volume of recycled resin, and that producers can adjust the molecular weight of virgin chip (VC) to accommodate varying usage of recycled resin. Petitioners also assert that producers can modify the production process to minimize problems related to discoloration caused by using recycled resin.

Petitioners contend that, in general, the methodologies used by Cheil and SKC to value recycled resin do not reflect the actual cost of that material. Petitioners assert that the Statement of