access and travel management. All Yakima Province Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public. Interested citizens are welcome to attend.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Direct questions regarding this meeting to Paul Hart, Designated Federal Official, USDA, Wenatchee National Forest, P.O. Box 811, Wenatchee, Washington. 98807, 509–662–4335.

Dated: August 1, 1995.

Paul Hart,

Designated Federal Official, Wenatchee National Forest.

[FR Doc. 95–19954 Filed 8–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Hearing on Racial and Ethnic Tensions in American Communities: Poverty, Inequality, and Discrimination-Miami

AGENCY: Commission on Civil Rights.

ACTION: Notice of hearing.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given pursuant to the provisions of the Civil Rights Commission Amendments of 1994, section 3, Public Law 103–419, 108 Stat. 4338, as amended, and 45 CFR 702.3, that a public hearing of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights will commence on Thursday, September 14 and 15, 1995, beginning at 8:00 a.m., in the Sandringham/Windsor Conference Room of the Intercontinental Hotel, 100 Chopin Plaza, Miami, Florida 33131.

The purpose of the hearing is to collect information within the jurisdiction of the Commission, under 45 CFR 702.2, related particularly to immigration practices, policies, and perceptions in Miami in order to examine underlying causes of racial and ethnic tensions in the United States.

The Commission is authorized to hold hearings and to issue subpoenas for the production of documents and the attendance of witnesses pursuant to 45 CFR 701.2(c). The Commission is an independent bipartisan, factfinding agency authorized to study, collect, and disseminate information, and to appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government, and to study and collect information with respect to discrimination or denials of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin, or in the administration of justice.

Hearing impaired persons who will attend the hearing and require the services of a sign language interpreter, should contact Betty Edmiston, Administrative Services and Clearinghouse Division, at (202) 376–8105 (TDD (202) 376–8116), at least five (5) working days before the scheduled date of the hearing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barbara Brooks, Press and Communications, (202) 376–8312.

Dated: August 8, 1995.

Miguel A. Sapp,

Acting Solicitor.

[FR Doc. 95–19974 Filed 8–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Coastal Zone Management: Federal Consistency Appeal by Mobil Exploration & Producing U.S. Inc. From an Objection by the State of Florida

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of decision.

On June 20, 1995, the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) issued a decision in the consistency appeal of Mobil Exploration & Producing U.S. Inc. (Mobil). Mobil is the operator of Outer Continental Leases OCS–G 10401, 10406, 10407, 10411, and 10412. The lease area, described as Pensacola Area Blocks 845, 846, 889, 890, 933 and 934 (Pensacola Blocks), is located in the northeast Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf, approximately 10–20 miles from Pensacola, Florida, and approximately 64 miles south-southeast of Theodore, Alabama. The Secretary decided to override the State of Florida's (State) objections to Mobil's Supplemental Plan of Exploration (SPOE).

In 1989, Mobil submitted a proposed Plan of Exploration (POE) to the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior (MMS) together with a certification that the proposed POE was consistent with the State's federally approved Coastal Management Program (CMP), as required under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), 16 U.S.C. 1451 *et seq.* Mobil proposed drilling six exploratory wells to evaluate the hydrocarbon potential of the Pensacola Area Blocks. MMS approved Mobil's POE and the State concurred with Mobil's consistency certification on April 17, 1990.

Subsequently, on September 6, 1991, Mobil submitted to the MMS a proposed SPOE to drill one additional exploratory well at Pensacola Block 889. The well site is located approximately 74 miles from Theodore, Alabama, and 13.5 miles from Pensacola, Florida. MMS approved Mobil's SPOE subject to the State'a review under the CZMA.

The State objected to Mobil's SPOE, finding the proposal for drilling the additional exploratory well is inconsistent with the State's policies of protecting its marine and coastal resources. Under section 307(c)(3)(B) of the CZMA, and 15 CFR 930.121 and 930.122, the State's objections preclude MMS from issuing a permit or license for Mobil's proposed activity, unless the Secretary finds that the activity is either consistent with the objectives or purposes of the CZMA (Ground I) or necessary in the interest of national security (Ground II). If the requirements of either Ground I or Ground II are met, the Secretary must override the State's objections.

In accordance with section 307(c)(3)(B) of the CZMA, Mobil filed an appeal with the Secretary arguing both Grounds I and II for a Secretarial override. Additionally, three threshold issues were raised by Mobil and the State during the course of the appeal. Upon consideration of the information submitted by Mobil, the State and interested Federal agencies, the Secretary made the findings discussed below.

Regarding the Secretary's findings on the three threshold issues, the decision determined that the State's objections were properly lodged, the Secretary will necessarily determine the adequacy of information for an override rather than summarily dismiss consistency appeals, and the activity before the Secretary on review in this appeal is the one additional exploratory well proposed in Mobil's SPOE.

The Secretary made the following findings with regard to Ground I: Mobil's proposed SPOE activity satisfies the first element of Ground I, because it furthers one of the objectives or purposes of the CZMA. The CZMA recognizes a national objective in achieving a greater degree of energy self-sufficiency. The proposed activity satisfies the second element of Ground I, since the adverse effects of the additional proposed exploratory well on the State's coastal resources and uses will not outweigh the benefit to the national interest.

Mobil's proposed SPOE also satisfies the third element of Ground I, because the activity will not violate the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act. Finally, Mobil's proposed SPOE satisfies the fourth element of Ground I, because there is no reasonable alternative

available to Mobil that would allow its proposed activity to be carried out in a manner consistent with the State's CMP.

Regarding Ground II, the decision finds that neither Mobil nor any Federal agency commenting on this ground specifically identified or explained how Mobil's inability to proceed with its proposed SPOE activity would significantly impair a national defense or other national security interest.

Because Mobil's propose SPOE satisfies all four of the requirements of Ground I, the Secretary's decision overrides the State's objections to Mobil's proposal for one additional exploratory well. Consequently, in deciding whether to permit the exploration activity proposed in Mobil's SPOE, MMS is not constrained by the States' objections under the CZMA. Copies of the decision may be obtained from the office listed below.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael I. Weiss, Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Assistant General Counsel for Ocean Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1305 East-West Highway, Suite 6110, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910, (301) 713–2967.

Dated: August 7, 1995.

Terry D. Garcia,

General Counsel.

(Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog No. 11.419 Coastal Zone Management Program Assistance.)

[FR Doc. 95–19987 Filed 8–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–08–M

International Trade Administration

[A–351–605]

Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice From Brazil

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 14, 1995.

SUMMARY: In response to timely requests for an administrative review by the respondents, Branco Peres Citrus, S.A. (Branco) and CTM Citrus S.A. (CTM), formerly Citropectina, S.A., the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice (FCOJ) from Brazil. This review covers two manufacturers/exporters of FCOJ to the United States during the period May 1, 1992, through April 30, 1993. We preliminarily determine the dumping margins for Branco and CTM during this period to be 2.52 and 0.98 percent, respectively. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donna Berg or Greg Thompson, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0114 or 482–3003, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 5, 1987, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on FCOJ from Brazil (52 FR 16426). The Department published in the **Federal Register** on April 28, 1993 a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' (58 FR 25802) of the antidumping duty order on FCOJ from Brazil for the period of review (POR), May 1, 1992, through April 30, 1993. On May 28, 1993, manufacturers/exporters, Branco and CTM, requested an administrative review for this POR. Branco also submitted a timely request for revocation of the antidumping duty order. The manufacturer/exporter, Frutropic/COINBRA, requested an administrative review for this POR on June 1, 1993. Accordingly, the Department initiated an administrative review on June 25, 1993, (58 FR 34414) with respect to Branco and CTM. On August 24, 1993, (58 FR 44653), we initiated a review with respect to Frutropic/COINBRA.

The Department issued an antidumping questionnaire to Branco, CTM and Frutropic/COINBRA on September 22, 1993. On October 11, 1994, the Department revoked the order with respect to Frutropic/COINBRA in the final results of the administrative review for the 1991 through 1992 POR (59 FR 53137, 53138, October 21, 1994).

Branco and CTM, on November 2 and 24, 1994, respectively, submitted their responses to the Department's questionnaire. On April 14, 1994, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire to both Branco and CTM. Branco and CTM submitted their responses to these supplemental questionnaires on May 12, 1994.

Verification of the factual information submitted by Branco in this review was conducted on June 22 and 23, 1994.

The Department issued a section D, cost of production/constructed value, questionnaire to Branco and CTM on August 5, 1994, because our preliminary analysis indicated that for certain U.S. sales, contemporaneous third country sales were unavailable for comparison purposes. Branco and CTM submitted comments regarding how foreign market value should be calculated in this review on August 17 and 18, 1994, respectively. (Note: whereas the Department initially believed that section D information was necessary, the Department subsequently revised its determination of the most appropriate methodology to apply in this review. See the ''Foreign Market Value'' section of this notice.)

On September 6, 1994, the Department requested clarification of both Branco's and CTM's responses. Branco and CTM submitted their responses in September 1994. The Department requested further information of both respondents on February 14 and March 15, 1995. Branco and CTM provided this information in March 1995.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of FCOJ from Brazil. The merchandise is currently classifiable under item 2009.11.00 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 review is dispositive.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales by Branco and CTM were made at less than fair value (LTFV), we compared the United States price (USP) to the foreign market value (FMV), as specified in the ''United States Price'' and ''Foreign Market Value'' sections of this notice.

United States Price

We based USP on purchase price, in accordance with section 772(b) of the Tariff Act, as amended (1994) (The Act), because all of Branco's and CTM's U.S. sales to the first unrelated purchaser took place prior to importation into the United States and exporter's sales price methodology was not otherwise indicated.

We calculated purchase price based on packed FOB prices to unrelated customers in the United States. We