ESTIMATES OF THE POPULATION OF VOTING AGE FOR EACH STATE AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: JULY 1, 1996—Continued

[In thousands]

Area	Population 18 and over
Oklahoma	2,420
Oregon	2,395
Pennsylvania	9,161
Rhode Island	755
South Carolina	2,761
South Dakota	528
Tennessee	3,997
Texas	13,676
Utah	1,322
Vermont	442
Virginia	5,044
Washington	4,096
West Virginia	1,404
Wisconsin	3,817
Wyoming	348

Source: Population Estimates Program, Population Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233.

For a description of methodology see Current Population Reports, P25–1127.

[FR Doc. 97–6636 Filed 3–12–97; 3:13 pm]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

International Trade Administration

[A–588–703]

Certain Internal-Combustion Industrial Forklift Trucks From Japan: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

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

SUMMARY: On February 6, 1997, the Department of Commerce published the final results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain internal-combustion industrial forklift trucks from Japan (62 FR 5592). The review covers three manufacturers/exporters. The period of review is June 1, 1994, through May 31, 1995. Based on the correction of a clerical error, we have changed the antidumping duty rate for Toyota Motor Corporation.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 17, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas O. Barlow or Kris Campbell, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 6, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain internal-combustion industrial forklift trucks from Japan (62 FR 5592) (final results). The review covers three manufacturers/exporters and the period of review (POR) is June 1, 1994, through May 31, 1995.

After publication of our final results, we received timely allegations from NACCO Materials Handling Group, Inc. (petitioners), and respondent, Toyota Motor Corporation (Toyota), that we had made clerical errors in calculating the final results. Based on our analysis of the clerical-error allegations, we have made a change to the final margin calculations for Toyota which resulted in a change to the weighted-average percentage margin for the POR (*see Amended Final Results* section of this notice).

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 Tariff Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. 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).

Clerical-Error Allegations and Responses

Toyota

On February 19, 1997, Toyota alleged that the Department improperly added the differences-in-merchandise (difmer) adjustment (home market variable cost of manufacturing minus U.S. variable cost of manufacturing) to normal value (NV) instead of subtracting it from NV.

Department's Response

We agree with Toyota that this was a clerical error. Therefore, we have subtracted the difmer amount from NV for these amended final results.

Petitioners

On February 21, 1997, petitioners alleged that the Department neglected to implement its twenty-percent difmer test in the final-results calculations. Petitioners claim that adding the test to the calculations will prevent sales that fail the test from being used in the margin analysis.

Department's Response

We disagree with petitioners that we made a clerical error in our matching process. For the final results, we performed the twenty-percent difmer test using Toyota's variable cost of manufacture (VCOM) data from the sales and concordance listings. We then used Toyota's cost information, as contained in the cost of production (COP) and constructed value (CV) portions of its response, to calculate the difmer adjustment that we made to NV. We fully addressed this issue in response to petitioners' comment 2 in the final results. Because we made a decision in our final results that applying the difmer test at the concordance stage was appropriate, given the circumstances of the review, we reject petitioners' position that this is a clerical error.

Amended Final Results

As a result of our correction for the clerical error, we determine that the following percentage weighted-average margin exists for the period June 1, 1994, through May 31, 1995:

Company	Rate (percent)
Toyota	47.79

We will direct the Customs Service to collect cash deposits of estimated antidumping duties on all appropriate entries in accordance with the procedures discussed in the final results of the review (62 FR 5592) and as amended by this determination.

The amended deposit requirements are effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice and shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also 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 the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative

protective orders (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

These amended final results of review and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.28 (1996).

Dated: March 7, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–6546 Filed 3–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–122–401]

Red Raspberries From Canada; Preliminary Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of new shipper review antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from one exporter/processor, Berryhill Foods, Inc. (Berryhill), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting a new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on red raspberries from Canada. The review covers sales during the period June 1, 1995 through May 31, 1996. We have preliminarily determined that Berryhill sold subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV) during the period of review. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 17, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Doyle, Lisa Yarbrough or Abdelai Elouaradia, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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 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).

Background

By letter dated June 28, 1996, Berryhill requested a new shipper review pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.22(h) of the Department's interim regulations, which govern determinations of antidumping duties for new shippers. These provisions state that, among other requirements, a producer or exporter requesting a new shipper review must include with its request the date on which the merchandise was first entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, or, if it cannot certify as to the date of first entry, the date on which it first shipped the merchandise for export to the United States (interim regulations, section 353.22(h)(2)(i)).

Berryhill provided a certification identifying the first date of shipment of subject merchandise to the United States. In addition, in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(i), Berryhill certified that it is not affiliated with any other firm nor did it export subject merchandise to the United States during the period of investigation. Based on this information, we determined that the requirements cited above were adequately fulfilled.

On September 11, 1996, the Department published a notice of initiation of a new shipper review of Berryhill (61 FR 47872). The Department is now conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act and section 353.22 of its interim regulations.

Scope of the Agreement

The products covered by this order are shipments of fresh and frozen red raspberries packed in bulk containers and suitable for further processing. These products are currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) item numbers 0810.20.90, 0810.20.10, and 0811.20.20. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Verification

As provided in section 776(b) of the Act, we conducted verification of information provided by the respondent by using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the respondent's facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public version of the verification report.

Export Price

We calculated the export price (EP) based on the price from Berryhill to unaffiliated parties where these sales were made prior to importation into the United States, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act. We calculated EP based on packed, F.O.B. cold storage prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions, where appropriate, for inland freight, brokerage and handling, U.S. Customs duties, and pre-sale warehouse expense, in accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act. No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

We calculated the constructed export price (CEP) based on the price from Berryhill to unaffiliated purchasers where these sales were made after importation into the United States, in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act. We calculated CEP based on packed, F.O.B. U.S. cold storage prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions, where appropriate, for inland freight, brokeage and handling, U.S. Customs duty, pre-sale warehouse expense, U.S. commissions, U.S. credit, U.S. inventory carrying costs, and profit allocable to the selling and distribution incurred in the United States in accordance with sections 772(c)(2), 772(d)(1) and 772(d)(3) of the Act.

Normal Value

Based on a comparison of the aggregate quantity of home market and U.S. sales, and absent any information that a particular market situation in the exporting country does not permit a proper comparison, we determined pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act that the quantity of foreign like product sold in the exporting country was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise to the United States. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, we based NV on sales in Canada, the home market.