8115–00–255–1346
8115–00–281–3877
8115–00–281–3882
8115–00–281–3886
8115–00–281–3889
8115–00–285–1116
8115–00–292–0724
8115–00–418–4660
8115–00–514–2404
8115–00–526–1617
8115–00–579–9153
8115–00–190–4864
8115–00–190–4865
8115–00–190–5053
8115–00–418–4657
8115–00–190–5011
8115–00–418–4654
8115–00–985–7312
8115–00–292–0120
8115–00–428–4145
8115–00–117–9529

Folder, File, Pressboard
7530–00–739–7723

Tape, Paper, Computing Machine
7530–00–286–9053
7530–00–222–3456

Binder, Looseleaf, (Pressboard)
7510–00–281–4311

Folder, File
7530–00–926–8977
7530–00–456–6140
7530–00–739–7723

*Services*

Food Service Attendant, Naval Station, Staten Island Galley, New York, New York

Elevator Operator, Wyoming Valley Veterans Building, 19 North Main Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania

Janitorial/Custodial, U.S. Army Reserve Center, 1522–24 E. Wingohocking Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Janitorial/Custodial, U.S. Army Reserve Center, 6th & Kedron Avenue, Folsom, Pennsylvania

Janitorial/Custodial, U.S. Army Reserve Center, Boot and Chestnut Streets, Downingtown, Pennsylvania

Janitorial/Custodial, U.S. Army Reserve Center, 950 Saw Mill Boulevard, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Janitorial/Custodial, Air National Guard Base, Otis, Massachusetts

Commissary Shelf Stocking and Custodial, Seneca Army Depot, Seneca, New York

Mailroom Operation, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, 405 Arsenal Street, Watertown, Massachusetts

Janitorial/Custodial, Domiciliary Buildings, VA Medical Center, Dublin, Georgia

Janitorial/Custodial, Department of the Army, Jimmy Doolittle Building, Columbia Metro Airport, West Columbia, South Carolina

Janitorial/Custodial, U.S. Army Reserve Center, 6300 West 7th Street, Texarkana, Texas

Parts Sorting, Red River Army Depot, Texarkana, Texas

Janitorial/Custodial, Buildings 928 and 1002, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico

Janitorial/Custodial, Armed Forces Reserve Center, Los Alamitos, California

Grounds Maintenance, North and South Duplexes, Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California

Beverly L. Milkman,

*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc. 96–20961 Filed 8–15–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A–614–801]**

### Fresh Kiwifruit From New Zealand (Kiwifruit); Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Extension of Time Limits for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit of the final results of this antidumping duty administrative review of Kiwifruit from New Zealand. The review covers the period June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 16, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Paul M. Stolz, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–4474.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time limit, the Department is extending the time limits for the completion of the final results until August 22, 1996, in accordance with Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. (*See* Memorandum to the file.)

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(A)(3)(a).

Dated: August 8, 1996.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 96–20932 Filed 8–15–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

**[A–588–839]**

### Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Sodium Azide from Japan

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 16, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William Crow or Magd Zalok, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0116 or (202) 482–4162, respectively.

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Rounds Agreements Act.

Preliminary Determination

We preliminarily determine that there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that sodium azide from Japan is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 733 of the Act. The estimated margins of sales at LTFV are shown in the ''Suspension of Liquidation'' section of this notice.

*Case History*

Since the initiation of this investigation, the following events have occurred (*Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Sodium Azide from Japan*, 61 FR 4959, (February 9, 1996) (*Initiation Notice*):

On March 8, 1996, the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) issued an affirmative preliminary injury determination in this case (*see* ITC Investigation No. 731–TA–740).

On March 20, 1996, we determined the appropriate recipients of the AD questionnaire (*see* the March 20, 1996 Memorandum to the file through David L. Binder) and issued the complete questionnaire to Masuda Chemical Corporation (Masuda), Nippon Carbide Industries Co. Ltd. (NCI), and Toyo

Kasei Koygo Co., Ltd. (TKK). Also, on April 1, 1996, the Department instructed respondents to report the date of sale based on the date of invoice as recorded in the responding companies' records in the ordinary course of business, according to the Department's amended date of sale practice. (*See* the April 1, 1996, letters to respondents from David L. Binder.)

We received Masuda's questionnaire responses to section A (dealing with general corporate information), as well as sections B and C (dealing with home market and U.S. market sales information), on April 19 and May 31, 1996, respectively.

On May 9, 1996, American Azide Corporation, the petitioner in this investigation, requested that the Department postpone the preliminary determination. Consequently, the Department postponed the preliminary determination until no later than August 13, 1996. (61 FR 26878 May 29, 1996). The petitioner also submitted an allegation on June 21, 1996, that Masuda had made home market sales below cost of production (COP) during the POI. On July 17, 1996, the Department initiated an investigation of home market sales below cost (*see* the July 17, 1996, memorandum from the Team to Gary Taverman), and issued a letter to Masuda instructing it to respond to section D of the March 20, 1996, questionnaire.

On August 7, 1996, Masuda requested an extension until September 16, 1996, to respond to section D. The Department granted Masuda an extension to respond to the section D questionnaire until no later than September 5, 1996. Because of the filing date of the cost allegation we will be unable to address it until the final determination.

*Facts Available for TKK and NCI*

A. TKK

We did not receive a response from TKK to the Department's questionnaire. Section 776(a)(2) of the Act provides that if an interested party withholds information that has been requested by the Department, fails to provide such information in a timely manner or in the form or manner requested, significantly impedes a determination under the antidumping statute, or provides such information but the information cannot be verified, the Department shall use facts otherwise available in reaching the applicable determination. Because TKK failed to submit the information that the Department had specifically requested, it is necessary to use of facts otherwise available for TKK.

Section 776(b) provides that adverse inferences may be used against a party that has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with requests for information (*see* also the Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) accompanying the URAA, clarifies that the petition is secondary information). See SAA, published in H. Doc. 103–316, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. At 870. Again, TKK's failure to provide any information to the Department demonstrates that TKK has failed to cooperate in this investigation. Thus, the Department has determined that, in selecting from among the facts otherwise available, an adverse inference is warranted. As facts otherwise available, we are assigning to TKK the highest margin in the petition, 65.80 percent.

Section 776(c) provides that when the Department relies on secondary information in using the facts otherwise available it must, to the extent practicable, corroborate that information. When analyzing the petition, the Department reviewed all of the data the petitioner had submitted and the assumptions that petitioner made in calculating estimated dumping margins. In accordance with section 776(c) of the Act, the Department attempted to corroborate the petition information by comparing the petition information on export price to U.S. Customs data. This source records prices based on the HTSUS subheading 2850.00.50.00 and confirms that the prices contained in the petition have probative value. Moreover, we compared the petitioner's estimated home market prices on which the normal value in the petition was based to home market prices available on the record of this investigation. We found that the estimated normal value in the petition has probative value. (*See* Memorandum dated August 8, 1996 from the team to Gary Taverman.)

B. NCI

On April 10, 1996, NCI responded to the Department's questionnaire by stating that it made no sales of sodium azide in the United States during the POI. NCI, however, stated that it made a shipment of sample sales of the subject merchandise during the POI. In response to our request for information on the sample sales, NCI submitted a letter on April 17, 1996, providing argument and data to support its contention that the date of sale for a sample sale which it claimed to be the only possible sale of subject merchandise, was on a date preceding the POI.

On May 31, 1996, the Department requested additional information from NCI concerning possible ''likely sales,'' as defined in 19 CFR 353.2(t), made during the POI. On June 10, 1996, NCI submitted its response that ''it clearly could not have been involved with any likely sales during the period of investigation,'' and stating that ''NCI has determined that it cannot justify incurring further costs at this time. Accordingly, NCI can no longer respond to the Department's requests for information.'' On July 11, 1996, the Department contacted NCI's counsel to request clarification on its refusal to further cooperate in this investigation. As recorded in the July 31, 1996, memorandum to the file from Jennifer Stagner, counsel for NCI declined to continue to participate in the investigation. Counsel for NCI confirmed that NCI would not permit the Department to conduct verification of its claim that there were no sales, nor likely sales, of subject merchandise to the United States during the POI.

The verification of NCI's response was material to the Department's ability to confirm that it did not need to include NCI as a respondent in this investigation. Therefore, the Department finds that, because NCI has stated that it will not respond to any additional requests for information nor permit verification, it has failed to cooperate to the best of its ability to comply with our request for information. Accordingly, for purposes of the preliminary determination the application of section 776(b) is warranted. In this case, the petition is the only information on the record which could form the basis for a dumping calculation for NCI (*see* the Facts Available for TKK section above for detail on corroborating the information in the petition). Therefore, the Department has based the margins for NCI on information in the petition. As facts otherwise available, we are assigning to NCI the highest margin in the petition, 65.80 percent. We note, however, that since NCI has responded sufficiently to the Department's questionnaires, the Department's decision as to whether adverse facts available should be used for NCI may be revisited for purposes of the final determination in the event NCI allows the Department to collect any necessary additional information and conduct verification.

*Postponement of Final Determination*

On August 7, 1996, Masuda requested that, pursuant to section 735(a)(2)(A) of the Act, in the event of an affirmative preliminary determination in this investigation, the Department postpone

its final determination until not later than 135 days after the publication of the affirmative preliminary determination in the Federal Register. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.20(b), inasmuch as our preliminary determination is affirmative, the respondent accounts for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise, and there are no compelling reasons for denying the request, we are granting respondent's request and postponing the final determination. Suspension of liquidation will be extended accordingly. *See Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Large Newspaper Printing Presses and Components thereof, whether Assembled or Unassembled, from Japan,* (61 FR 8029 March 1, 1996).

*Scope of Investigation*

The product covered by this investigation is sodium azide ($NaN_3$) regardless of use, and whether or not combined with silicon oxide ($SiO_2$) or any other inert flow assisting agent. The merchandise under investigation is currently classifiable under item 2850.00.50.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

*Period of Investigation*

The period of investigation is January 1, through December 31, 1995.

*Product Comparisons*

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products produced by the respondent, covered by the description in the *Scope of Investigation* section, above, and sold in the home market during the POI, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. In addition, in this case we found all home market merchandise to be identical to the U.S. merchandise. (*See* the March 20, 1996, Memorandum to the file through David L. Binder.)

*Classification of Grinding Costs*

For purposes of the preliminary determination, we have rejected Masuda's classification of grinding costs as direct selling expenses subject to a circumstance-of-sale adjustment. We have determined that grinding costs represent a production cost and should be included in the calculation of the costs associated with physical differences in merchandise. However, as explained below, the Department will consider whether to make a ''quantity adjustment'' for differences in grinding costs under 19 CFR 353.55 for the final determination.

*Quantity Adjustment*

The Department's regulations provide that ''the Secretary will make a reasonable allowance for any difference in quantities, to the extent that the Secretary is satisfied that the amount of any price differential is wholly or partly due to that difference in quantities.'' See 19 CFR 353.55(a). The Department's position is that ''to be eligible for a quantity based adjustment, a respondent must demonstrate a clear and direct correlation between price differences and quantities sold or costs incurred. *See* Brass Sheet and Strip from the Federal Republic of Germany, Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, (56 FR 60087 November 27, 1991); see also *Brass Sheet and Strip from the Netherlands,* (53 FR 2341 June 22, 1988). In the case of a claim based on cost differences, the respondent must provide evidence of savings which are specifically attributable to the purchase of materials or provision of services at a discount due to the quantity purchased. In the instant case, Masuda has indicated that the cost of grinding provided by a third party are lower when larger quantities are processed. However, Masuda has not provided sufficient evidence that there is a clear and direct correlation between price differences and quantities sold or costs incurred; the grinding cost data provided by Masuda is not evidence *per se* of specific discounts due to quantities purchased. Accordingly, for this preliminary determination, we have not made a quantity adjustment. However, if Masuda provides additional, timely, and verifiable information on this claimed adjustment, we will reconsider it for the final determination.

*Technical Services*

Masuda reported a technical service expense as a direct selling expense, claiming that the Department has previously allowed claims for services rendered for assisting the customer in solving problems with products purchased during the POI. We believe that the information on the record does not sufficiently substantiate Masuda's claim. Therefore, for purposes of the preliminary determination, we are rejecting Masuda's classification of this cost as a direct selling expense. However, we will request additional information regarding this expense, which will be analyzed, verified, and considered for the final determination.

*Level of Trade*

As set forth in section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and in the SAA accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, at 829–831, to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate normal values based on sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sales. When the Department is unable to find sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale(s), the Department may compare sales in the U.S. and foreign markets at different levels of trade. *See* also, *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Italy* (61 FR 30326, June 14, 1996) (*Pasta from Italy*).

In accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act, if sales at different levels of trade are compared, the Department will adjust the normal value to account for the difference in level of trade if two conditions are met. First, there must be differences between the actual selling functions performed by the seller at the level of trade of the U.S. sale and the level of trade of the normal value sale. Second, the differences must affect price comparability as evidenced by a pattern of consistent price differences between sales at the different levels of trade in the market in which normal value is determined.

In implementing this provision, the Department's first task was to obtain information about the selling activities of the producers/exporters. Information relevant to level of trade comparisons and adjustments was requested in our supplemental questionnaire. We asked the respondent to establish any claimed levels of trade based on the selling functions provided to each proposed customer group, and to document and explain any claims for a level of trade adjustment.

Our review of these submissions shows that Masuda has identified levels of trade based on its selling activities by customer categories. In order to confirm whether separate levels of trade actually existed within or between the U.S. and home markets, we reviewed the selling functions attributable to the customer categories claimed by Masuda. Pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, and the SAA at 827, in identifying levels of trade for directly observed (*i.e.*, not constructed) export price and normal value sales, we considered the selling functions reflected in the starting price, before any adjustments.

We examined certain selling functions indicated in the August 8, 1996, memorandum from Jennifer Stagner to the file. In addition to the selling

functions reported by Masuda for each claimed level of trade, we considered all types of selling functions reported in all sections of the response. Where possible, we further examined whether the selling function was performed on a substantial portion of sales. In analyzing the record evidence, we examined selling functions in aggregate. (*See, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments,* (61 FR 7307, 7348 February 27, 1996) (Proposed Regulations).

We preliminarily determined that there is one U.S. level of trade and two home market levels of trade, one of which is identical in aggregate selling functions to that found in the United States. We compared sales at the sole level of trade in the U.S. market to sales at the identical home market level of trade. We found matches for each U.S. sale at the same level of trade. Therefore, we did not need to compare sales at the next most similar level of trade and determine whether a level of trade adjustment was appropriate.

*Fair Value Comparisons*

To determine whether sales of sodium azide by Masuda to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared the export price (EP) to the Normal Value (NV), as described in the ''Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(1)(A)(i), we calculated weighted-average EPs for comparisons to weighted-average NVs.

*Export Price*

We calculated EP, in accordance with subsections 772(a) and (c) of the Act, where the subject merchandise was first sold in Japan to an unaffiliated purchaser prior to importation and CEP was not otherwise warranted based on the facts of record.

We calculated EP based on prices to the unaffiliated trading companies in Japan. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price (gross unit price) for foreign inland freight.

For all U.S. sales, Masuda reported the sale of subject merchandise to an unaffiliated trading company in Japan. Section 772(a) of the Act defines the export price as the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) by the producer to an unaffiliated purchaser for exportation to the United States. Where the respondent producer of the merchandise under investigation knew at the time of the sale to the trading company that the merchandise was destined for the United States, the export price would be the price between the respondent and the unaffiliated trading company. Masuda has stated that it knew or had reason to know at the time of sale that the ultimate destination of the merchandise was the United States because the manufacture and packing of sodium azide is to the exact specifications of the ultimate U.S. market end-users. Therefore, we determined that Masuda's U.S. export price is the price to the unaffiliated trading company.

We recalculated Masuda's credit expenses to account for missing data in the reported interest rate calculation. As facts available, we applied the single highest reported monthly interest rate to those months in the POI for which no rate was reported because the information on the record indicated that the highest rate was the most appropriate estimate of the missing data. We then recalculated a simple average interest rate for the entire year. Because the U.S. sales were denominated in Yen, we calculated interest expenses by applying the average yen interest rate reported by Masuda.

The Department explained its policy in selecting the interest rate applicable in calculating imputed credit expenses in the *Final Determination of Sales at LTFV: Oil Country Tubular Goods from Austria,* (60 FR 33551, 33555 June 28, 1995) (*OCTG from Austria*):

> A company selling in a given currency (such as sales denominated in dollars) is effectively lending to its purchasers in the currency in which its receivables are denominated (in this case, in dollars) for the period from shipment of its goods until the date it receives payment from its purchaser. Thus, when sales are made in, and future payments are expected in, a given currency, the measure of the company's extension of credit should be based on an interest rate tied to the currency in which its receivables are denominated. Only then does establishing a measure of imputed credit recognize both the time value of money and the effect of currency fluctuations on repatriating revenue.

Since Masuda receives payment from Japanese trading companies in Yen, its receivables are denominated in Yen, and therefore the applicable interest rate should be a Yen rate. We also added duty drawback to EP in accordance with section 772(c)(B) of the Act.

*Normal Value*

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared Masuda's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Since Masuda's aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales for the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market was viable for Masuda. Therefore, we have based NV on home market sales.

Masuda requested that the Department exclude certain sales in the home market during the POI, claiming that these sales were made outside the ordinary course of trade. According to Masuda, the sales in question were made in smaller quantities than other home market sales, at substantially higher than average prices, and for testing purposes. For this preliminary determination, we have rejected Masuda's request because, generally, it is the Department's practice to include in its analysis sales for testing purposes. *See Color Picture Tubes From Korea: Final Results of Administrative Review,* (56 FR 19084 April 25, 1991); *Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp* v. *U.S.,* 739 F.S. 613 (CIT 1990). Moreover, we found that other home market sales in Masuda's database had unit prices higher than (and quantities comparable to) those of the sales which Masuda has sought to exclude from the margin calculations.

We calculated NV based on prices to unaffiliated customers. Where appropriate we made deductions from the starting price (gross price) for foreign inland freight, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. In addition, we adjusted for differences in circumstances of sale for imputed credit expenses. We recalculated Masuda's credit expenses to account for missing data in the reported interest rate calculation. As facts available, we applied the highest reported monthly interest rate to those months in the POI for which no rate was reported and then re-calculated a simple average interest rate for the entire year. (*See* the *Export Price* section for further detail on the facts available related to the interest rate).

*Currency Conversion*

Section 773A(a) of the Act directs the Department to convert foreign currencies based on the dollar exchange rate in effect on the date of sale of the subject merchandise, except if it is established that a currency transaction on forward markets is directly linked to an export sale. When a company demonstrates that a sale on forward markets is directly linked to a particular export sale in order to minimize its exposure to exchange rate losses, the Department will use the rate of exchange in the forward currency sale agreement.

Section 773A(a) also directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate

in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, unless the daily rate involves a ''fluctuation.'' It is the Department's practice to find that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from the benchmark rate by 2.25 percent. The benchmark is defined as the rolling average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determined a fluctuation existed, we substituted the benchmark for the daily rate, in accordance with established practice. Further, section 773A(b) directs the Department to allow a 60-day adjustment period when a currency has undergone a sustained movement. A sustained movement has occurred when the weekly average of actual daily rates exceeds the weekly average of benchmark rates by more than five percent for eight consecutive weeks. (For an explanation of this method, *see, Policy Bulletin 96–1: Currency Conversions,* 61 FR 9434, March 8, 1996.). Such an adjustment period is required only when a foreign currency is appreciating against the U.S. dollar.

*Verification*

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we will verify all information determined to be acceptable for use in making our final determination.

*Suspension of Liquidation*

In accordance with section 733(d) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of sodium azide from Japan, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register. We are also instructing the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond equal to the weighted-average amount by which the normal value exceeds the export price, as indicated in the chart below. These suspension of liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice.

| Exporter/manufacturer | Weighted-average margin percentage |
|---|---|
| Masuda | 29.50 |
| NCI | 65.80 |
| TKK | 65.80 |
| All Others | 29.50 |

*ITC Notification*

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine before the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 45 days after our final determination whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry.

*Public Comment*

Case briefs or other written comments in at least ten copies must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration no later than November 20, 1996, and rebuttal briefs, no later than November 27, 1996. A list of authorities used and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. Such summary should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes. In accordance with section 774 of the Act, we will hold a public hearing, if requested, to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs. Tentatively, the hearing will be held on November 29, 1996, the time and place to be determined, at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room B–099, within ten days of the publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) the party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. If this investigation proceeds normally, we will make our final determination by 135 days after the publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

This determination is published pursuant to section 733(d) of the Act.

Dated: August 9, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 96–20891 Filed 8–15–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

Pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301), we invite comments on the question of whether instruments of equivalent scientific value, for the purposes for which the instruments shown below are intended to be used, are being manufactured in the United States.

Comments must comply with 15 CFR 301.5(a) (3) and (4) of the regulations and be filed within 20 days with the Statutory Import Programs Staff, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

*Docket Number:* 96–078. *Applicant:* Argonne National Laboratory-West, I.N.E.L., EBR–II Site, Scoville, ID 83415. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope, Model JEM–2010. *Manufacturer:* JEOL Ltd., Japan. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used for examining materials primarily associated with decommissioning of a nuclear reactor and its associated waste streams; as well as characterization of high level waste forms. The primary items of interest are defect and phase identification, chemical segregation and boundary chemical and crystallographic characterization. *Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs:* July 23, 1996.

*Docket Number:* 96–079. *Applicant:* University of Arizona, Department of Geosciences, Gould-Simpson Building, Room 208, Tucson, AZ 85721. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model Sector 54. *Manufacturer:* Micromass, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used for the study of U-Th-Pb, Lu-Hf, Sm-Nd and Rb-Sr isotopic systems. *Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs:* July 22, 1996.

*Docket Number:* 96–080. *Applicant:* Berkeley Geochronology Center, 2455 Ridge Road, Berkeley, CA 94709. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model Sector 54. *Manufacturer:* Micromass, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used in age determinations (geochronology) of geologic and archaeologic materials, such as rocks, minerals, artifacts and fossils. These ages will be determined by analysis of the isotopic ratios of various elements, typically but not exclusively uranium, thorium, lead, strontium and neodymium. In addition, the instrument will be used for training of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows from a variety of universities as part of collaborative research. *Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs:* July 23, 1996.

*Docket Number:* 96–081. *Applicant:* Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, 423 East 23rd Street, New York, NY 10010. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope, Model JEM–1010.