The refinery complex (105,000 BPD, 242 employees) is located on a 620-acre site at 2500 E. St. Bernard Highway on the Mississippi River, St. Bernard Parish (Meraux area), Louisiana, some 7 miles southeast of New Orleans.

The refinery is used to produce fuels and petrochemical feedstocks. Fuels produced include gasoline, jet fuel, distillates, residual fuels and naphthas. Petrochemical feedstocks and refinery by-products include methane, ethane, propane, propylene, butane, petroleum coke, asphalt and sulfur. Some 92 percent of the crude oil (96 percent of inputs), and some feedstocks and motor fuel blendstocks are sourced abroad.

Zone procedures would exempt the refinery 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, natural gas condensate). The duty rates on inputs 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 has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment 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 [60 days from date of publication]. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to September 24, 1996).

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

U.S. Department of Commerce, Export Assistance Center, Hale Boggs Federal Building, 501 Magazine Street, Room 1043, New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

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

Dated: July 2, 1996.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–17678 Filed 7–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

International Trade Administration

[A–421–803]

Notice of Court Decision: Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From the Netherlands

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

SUMMARY: On June 14, 1996, The United States Court of International Trade (the CIT) affirmed the Department of Commerce's (the Department) redetermination on remand of the Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Netherlands (58 FR 37199 , July 9,1993), as amended by the Antidumping Duty Order (58 FR 44172, August 19, 1993). *National Steel Corp.* versus *United States,* (Slip. Op. 96–97, Court No. 93–09–00616, June 14) (National Steel).

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 11, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David J. Goldberger at (202) 482–4136, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 14, 1996, the CIT accepted the Department's methodology for selecting the highest non-aberrant margin to be applied to the respondent's, Hoogovens Groep B.V., unreported exporter's sales price data. The CIT also accepted the Department's methodology for calculating the cash deposit rate after the Department had revised its value-added tax adjustment methodology, in accordance with *Federal-Mogul Corp.* versus *United States,* 63 F.3d 1572, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1995), under remand.

In its decision in *Timken Co.* versus *United States,* 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (Timken), the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1516a(e), the Department must publish a notice of a court decision which is not ''in harmony'' with a Department determination, and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a ''conclusive'' court decision. The CIT's decision in National Steel on June 14, 1996, constitutes a decision ''not in harmony'' with the Department's final affirmative determination. This notice fulfills the publication requirements of Timken.

Accordingly, the Department will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise pending the expiration of the period of appeal, or, if appealed, upon a ''conclusive'' court decision.

Dated: July 5, 1996.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–17677 Filed 7–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–475–811]

Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel From Italy: 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: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on grain-oriented electrical steel from Italy in response to a request by the respondent, Acciai Speciali Terni S.p.A. (''AST''). This covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review (POR), February 9, 1994, through July 31, 1995.

AST has withdrawn from participation in this review and failed to submit a response to Section D of the Department's questionnaire. As a result, we have preliminarily determined to use facts otherwise available for cash deposit and assessment purposes.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 11, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Decker or Robin Gray, Office of Agreements Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3793.

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreement Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the

current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published in the Federal Register an antidumping order on grain-oriented electrical steel from Italy on August 12, 1994 (59 FR 41431). On August 1, 1995, we published in the Federal Register (60 FR 39150) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping order on grain-oriented electrical steel from Italy covering the period February 9, 1994, through July 31, 1995.

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(1)(1995), the respondent, AST, requested that we conduct an administrative review of its sales. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on September 15, 1995 (60 FR 47930). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of This Review

The product covered by this review is grain-oriented silicon electrical steel, which is a flat-rolled alloy steel product containing by weight at least 0.6 percent of silicon, not more than 0.08 percent of carbon, not more than 1.0 percent of aluminum, and no other element in an amount that would give the steel the characteristics of another alloy steel, of a thickness of no more than 0.560 millimeters, in coils of any width, or in straight lengths which are of a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) under item numbers 7225.10.0030, 7225.30.7000, 7225.40.7000, 7225.50.8000, 7225.90.0000, 7226.10.1030, 7226.10.5015, 7226.10.5056, 7226.91.7000, 7226.91.8000, 7226.92.5000, 7226.92.7050, 7226.92.8050, 7226.99.0000, 7228.30.8050, 7228.60.6000, and 7229.90.1000. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written descriptions of the scope of these proceedings are dispositive.

This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of grain-oriented electrical steel, and the period February 9, 1994, through July 31, 1995.

Use of Facts Available

We preliminarily determine, in accordance with section 776(a)(C) of the Act, that the use of facts available is appropriate for AST because it significantly impeded this review by not responding to Section D of the Department's antidumping questionnaire and by refusing to further participate in the review proceedings. We sent AST a questionnaire on September 27, 1995, with deadlines of October 25, 1995, for section A and November 24, 1995, for sections B and C. AST filed timely responses to these sections. On February 16, 1996, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire on sections A through C. On February 27, 1996, AST requested and was granted a two-week extension for the submission of a response to the supplemental questionnaire. AST filed the response to the supplemental questionnaire on the deadline of March 15, 1996.

On January 26, 1996, petitioners (Allegheny Ludlum Corporation, Armco, Inc., United Steel Workers of America, Butler Armco Independent Union, and Zanesville Armco Independent) made a sales-below-cost allegation, which the Department accepted, and a request for cost information (section D) was issued on February 15, 1996, with a deadline of March 18, 1996. AST requested an extension for its cost submission until March 29, 1996, which the Department granted. AST then requested another extension on its cost submission until April 12, 1996. The Department extended the deadline by five days, making it due on April 3, 1996. AST did not submit its cost response on that date. On April 4, 1996, AST filed a letter indicating its withdrawal from participation in the review.

Necessary information is not available on the record with regard to AST's cost of production because AST withheld the requested information. Therefore, we must make our preliminary determination based on facts otherwise available (section 776(a) of the Act).

Where the Department must rely on the facts available because the respondent failed to cooperate to the best of its ability, section 776(b) authorizes the Department to use an inference adverse to the interests of that respondent in choosing the facts available. Section 776(b) also authorizes the Department to use as adverse facts available information derived from the petition, the final determination, a previous administrative review, or other information placed on the record. Because information from prior proceedings constitutes secondary information, section 776(c) provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) provides that ''corroborate'' means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value.

To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, unlike other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenese, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. The only source for margins is administrative determinations. Thus, in an administrative review, if the Department chooses as total adverse facts available a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period. With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregared the margin and determine an appropriate margin (see, e.g., Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review (61 FR 6812, February 22, 1996), where the Department disregarded the highest margin in that case as adverse BIA because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin). In this case, we have used the highest rate from any prior segment of the proceeding, 60.79 percent, because there is no reliable evidence on the record indicating that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available.

On April 1, 1996, the Department published in the Federal Register (61 FR 14291) an extension of time limits for antidumping administrative reviews, including the review on grain-oriented electrical steel from Italy. The Department determined it was not practicable to complete these reviews within the time limits mandated by the Act. Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the Department extended the time limits for this review until September 27, 1996, for the preliminary results of administrative review, and April 2, 1997 for the final results. However, the entire amount of additional time is no longer necessary

because AST has refused to further participate in the review proceedings.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Acciai Speciali Terni S.p.A.	2/9/94–7/31/95	60.79

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between export price and NV may vary from the percentage stated above. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue assessment instruction directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of grain-oriented electrical steel from Italy entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(c) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for reviewed companies will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (2) for previously 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 less-than-fair-value 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) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be the rate established in the investigation of sales at less than fair value, which is 60.79 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 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 Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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

Dated: June 28, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–17676 Filed 7–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

National Weather Service Modernization and Associated Restructuring

AGENCY: National Weather Service (NWS), NOAA, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice and opportunity for public comment.

SUMMARY: The NWS is publishing proposed certifications for the proposed consolidations of:

(1) Residual Des Moines Weather Service Office (WSO) into the future Des Moines Weather Forecast Office (WFO);

(2) Residual Louisville WSO into the future Louisville WFO;

(3) Residual St. Louis WSO into the future St. Louis WFO;

(4) Columbia WSO into the future Kansas City/Pleasant Hill, Springfield, and St. Louis WFOs;

(5) Lansing WSO into the future Grand Rapids WFO;

(6) Lexington WSO into the future Louisville and Cincinnati WFOs;

(7) Lincoln WSO into the future Omaha WFO;

(8) Sioux City WSO into the future Omaha and Sioux Falls WFOs;

(9) Baton Rouge WSO into the future New Orleans/Baton Rouge, Lake Charles, and Jackson WFOs; and

(10) Montgomery WSO into the future Birmingham, Mobile, and Tallahassee WFOs.

In accordance with Pub. Law 102–567, the public will have 60-days in which to comment on these proposed consolidation certifications.

DATES: Comments are requested by September 9, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Requests for copies of the proposed consolidation packages should be sent to Tom Beaver, Room 12314, 1325 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910, telephone 301–713–0300. All comments should be sent to Tom Beaver at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Julie Scanlon at 301–713–1413.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NWS anticipates consolidating:

(1) The Residual Des Moines Weather Service Office (WSO) with the future Des Moines Weather Forecast Office (WFO);

(2) The Residual Louisville WSO with the future Louisville WFO;

(3) The Residual St. Louis WSO with the future St. Louis WFO;

(4) The Columbia WSO with the future Kansas City/Pleasant Hill, Springfield, and St. Louis WFOs;

(5) The Lansing WSO with the future Grand Rapids WFO;

(6) The Lexington WSO with the future Louisville and Cincinnati WFOs;

(7) The Lincoln WSO with the future Omaha WFO;

(8) The Sioux City WSO with the future Omaha and Sioux Falls WFOs;

(9) The Baton Rouge WSO with the future New Orleans/Baton Rouge, Lake Charles, and Jackson WFOs; and

(10) The Montgomery WSO with the future Birmingham, Mobile, and Tallahassee WFOs.

In accordance with section 706 of Pub. Law 102–567, the Secretary of Commerce must certify that these consolidations will not result in any degradation of service to the affected areas of responsibility and must publish the proposed consolidation certifications in the FR. The documentation supporting each proposed certification includes the following:

(1) A draft memorandum by the meteorologist-in-charge recommending the certification, the final of which will be endorsed by the Regional Director and the Assistant Administrator of the NWS if appropriate, after consideration of public comments and completion of consultation with the Modernization Transition Committee (the Committee);

(2) A description of local weather characteristics and weather-related concerns which affect the weather services provided within the service area;

(3) A comparison of the services provided within the service area and the