

# Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 62, No. 23

Tuesday, February 4, 1997

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Western Washington Cascades Province Interagency Executive Committee (PIEC) Advisory Committee

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Western Washington Cascades PIEC Advisory Committee will meet on February 27, 1997 at the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest Headquarters, 21905 64th Avenue West, in Mountlake Terrace, Washington. The meeting will begin at 9:00 a.m. and continue until about 4:00 p.m. Agenda items to be covered include: (1) discussion of logistics, operating procedures, and expected accomplishments under the renewed charter; (2) updates on watershed analyses completed or in progress, Adaptive Management Area plans, the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest fiscal year 1997 flood repair and watershed restoration program, and other current issues; (3) update on the River Basin Information Management framework project begun under the auspices of the previous Advisory Committee, and a demonstration of the Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Information Management System (EIMS); (4) planned review and revision of the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest monitoring and evaluation strategy; and, (5) open public forum. All Western Washington Cascades Province Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public. Interested citizens are encouraged to attend.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Direct questions regarding this meeting to Chris Hansen-Murray, Province Liaison, USDA, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, 21905 64th Avenue West, Mountlake Terrace, Washington 98043, 206-744-3276.

Dated: January 28, 1997.  
Dennis E. Bschor,  
*Forest Supervisor.*  
[FR Doc. 97-2680 Filed 2-3-97; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 3410-11-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[Docket No. A-427-812]

#### Calcium Aluminate Flux From France; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On August 2, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its 1994-95 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on calcium aluminate flux from France (CA flux) (61 FR 40396). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter, Lafarge Aluminate Flux, Inc. (Lafarge), for the period June 15, 1994, through May 31, 1995.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. On September 3, 1996, we received a case brief from the sole respondent, Lafarge. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes, primarily clerical in nature, to these final results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 4, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Maureen McPhillips or Linda Ludwig, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-3019 or 482-3833, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On August 2, 1996, the Department published in the Federal Register (61 FR 40396) the preliminary results of the antidumping duty order on calcium aluminate flux from France (59 FR 30337). The Department has now completed this administrative review in

accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

We received a case brief from the sole respondent, Lafarge, on September 3, 1996. The petitioners did not file a case brief.

#### Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise stated, all citations to the Tariff Act are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements 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).

#### Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of CA Flux, other than white, high purity CA flux. This product contains by weight more than 32 percent but less than 65 percent alumina and more than one percent each of iron and silica.

CA flux is currently classified under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheading 2523.10.000. The HTSUS is provided for convenience and U.S. Customs' purposes only. The written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive. This review covers the period June 15, 1994 through May 31, 1995.

#### Analysis of Comments Received

*Comment 1:* Lafarge states that the Department in its computer program failed to convert two home market variables from metric tons to short tons to ensure accurate comparisons to the U.S. sales amounts in short tons. In addition, two variables expressed as amounts per short ton were incorrectly multiplied by the quantity expressed in metric tons.

*Department's Position:* As stated in our calculation memorandum, dated August 16, 1996, we intended to convert all home market sales variables from metric tons to short tons and have done so for these final results.

*Comment 2:* Lafarge contends that we used an incorrect variable when calculating total movement expenses.

*Department's Position:* We agree with Lafarge and have made the necessary changes in the computer program.

*Comment 3:* Lafarge maintains that the Department erred in its calculation of profit in the computer program when it failed to use the information submitted by Lafarge on the total cost of manufacturing (COM). In addition, Lafarge points out that the computer program does not reflect the Department's intent, as stated in its notice of preliminary results, to deduct the cost of goods sold, along with selling and movement expenses, from total revenue in its calculation of profit.

*Department's Position:* We did use the COM information as submitted by Lafarge in short tons, not metric tons. To calculate profit for these final results we converted the total home market costs to total cost in short tons before adding it to the U.S. total cost which Lafarge reported in short tons.

We agree with Lafarge that the cost of goods sold, along with selling and movement expenses, should be deducted from total revenue to calculate constructed export price profit. We have made this correction in our final results.

*Comment 4:* Lafarge states that the Department should continue to remove two zero quantity U.S. sales from the data base because these observations represent billing corrections and not actual sales.

*Department's Position:* We agree with Lafarge and have not used these two zero quantity U.S. sales in these final results.

#### Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following weighted-average margin exists:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Period of review	Margin (percent)
Lafarge Fondu Inter'l Inc. ....	06/15/94–05/31/95	31.04

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between export price and normal value may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of review for all shipments of calcium aluminate flux from France within the scope of the order entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate

for the reviewed company will be the rate listed above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the 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, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) 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 of 37.93 percent, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation, 59 FR 5994, (February 9, 1994) shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice 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 subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

#### Notification of Interested Parties

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) 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. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested.

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

Dated: January 27, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-2714 Filed 2-3-97; 8:45 am]1q01

BILLING CODE 3510-25-M

[C-122-825]

#### Final Negative Countervailing Duty Determination and Final Negative Critical Circumstances Determination: Certain Laminated Hardwood Trailer Flooring (LHF) From Canada

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce  
EFFECTIVE DATE: February 4, 1997.  
FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Boyland or Daniel Lessard, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office I, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4198 and 482-1778, respectively.  
FINAL DETERMINATION: The Department determines that countervailable subsidies are not being provided to manufacturers, producers, or exporters of LHF in Canada.

#### Case History

Since the publication of the preliminary negative determination (Preliminary Determination) in the Federal Register (61 FR 59079, November 20, 1996), the following events have occurred.

Verification of the responses of the Government of Canada (GOC), the Government of Quebec (GOQ), Nilus Leclerc, Inc. and Industries Leclerc, Inc., Erie Flooring and Wood Products (Erie), Industrial Hardwoods Products, Ltd. (IHP), and Milner Rigsby Co., Ltd. (Milner) was conducted between November 13 and 27, 1996.

Petitioner and respondents filed case and rebuttal briefs on December 17, 1996, and December 23, 1996, respectively. The hearing was held on January 7, 1997.

#### Scope of Investigation

The scope of this investigation consists of certain edge-glued hardwood flooring made of oak, maple, or other hardwood lumber. Edge-glued hardwood flooring is customized for specific dimensions and is provided to the consumer in "kits," or pre-sorted bundles of component pieces generally ranging in size from 6" to 14" x 48' to 57' x 1" to 1(1/2)" for trailer flooring, from 6" to 13" x 12' to 28' x 1(1/8)" to 1(1/2)" for vans and truck bodies, from 9" to 12(1/2)" x 8' to 10' x 1(7/8)" to 2(1/2)" for rail cars, and from 6" to 14" x 19' to 48' x 1(1/8)" to 1(3/8)" for containers.

The merchandise under investigation is currently classified, in addition to various other hardwood products, under subheading 4421.90.98.40 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Edge-glued hardwood flooring is commonly referred to as "laminated" hardwood flooring by buyers and sellers of subject