Whereas, an application from the Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism of the State of Hawaii, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 9 (Honolulu, Hawaii), requesting authority to expand the scope of activity conducted under zone procedures at FTZ Subzone 9B, at the Kerr Pacific Corporation/HFM Division plant, (formerly Hawaiian Flour Mills, Inc.) in Honolulu, Hawaii, to include the production of animal feed solely for Hawaiian and export markets, and requesting authority to expand the subzone boundary, was filed by the Board on June 8, 1994, and notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (FTZ Docket 24–94, 59 FR 35095, 7/8/94); and,

Whereas, the Board has found that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations are satisfied, and that approval of the application is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby authorizes the expansion of the subzone boundaries and the scope of activity at Subzone 9B at the plant site of Kerr Pacific Corporation/HFM Division, in Honolulu, Hawaii, as described in the application, and subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 1st day of September 1995.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

John J. DaPonte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–22505 Filed 9–8–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[Order No. 767]

Grant of Authority for Subzone Status; Rotorex Company, Inc. (Rotary Compressors), Walkersville, MD

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, by an Act of Congress approved June 18, 1934, an Act ''To provide for the establishment * * * of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes,'' as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u) (the Act), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) is authorized to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs ports of entry;

Whereas, the Board's regulations (15 CFR Part 400) provide for the establishment of special-purpose subzones when existing zone facilities cannot serve the specific use involved;

Whereas, an application from the Maryland Department of Transportation, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 73, for authority to establish special-purpose subzone status at the rotary compressor manufacturing plant of the Rotorex Company, Inc., in Walkersville, Maryland, was filed by the Board on September 6, 1994, and notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (FTZ Docket 30–94, 59 FR 48850, 9–23–94); and

Whereas, the Board has found that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations are satisfied, and that approval of the application is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby authorizes the establishment of a subzone (Subzone 73A) at the Rotorex Company, Inc., plant in Walkersville, Maryland, at the location described in the application, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 1st day of September 1995.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

John J. DaPonte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–22506 Filed 9–8–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[Order No. 764]

Expansion of Foreign-Trade Zone 122, Corpus Christi, TX

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, an application from the Port of Corpus Christi Authority, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 122, requesting authority to expand its general-purpose zone in the Corpus Christi, Texas, area, within the Corpus Christi Customs port of entry, was filed by the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board on August 25, 1994 (Docket 29–94, 59 FR 48850, 9/23/94);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board has found that the requirements of the Act and the regulations are satisfied, and that the proposal is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The grantee is authorized to expand its zone as requested in the application, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28, and subject to a 2,000-acre activation limit.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 1st day of September 1995.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

John J. DaPonte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–22504 Filed 9–8–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

International Trade Administration

[A–580–812]

Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit or Above From the Republic of Korea; 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: In response to requests from three respondents, one U.S. producer, and several interested parties, the Department of Commerce (the Department) has conducted an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on dynamic random access memory semiconductors of one megabit or above from the Republic of Korea. The review covers three manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States for the period of October 29, 1992 through April 30, 1994

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below the foreign market value (FMV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States price (USP) and the FMV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments 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: September 11, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas F. Futtner, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–3814.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 10, 1993, the Department of Commerce published in the **Federal Register** (58 FR 27520) the antidumping duty order on dynamic random access memory semiconductors (DRAMS) from the Republic of Korea. On May 4, 1994, the Department published (59 FR 23051) a notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' of this antidumping duty order for the period of October 29, 1992, through April 30, 1994. We received timely requests for review from Hyundai Electronics Industries, Co. (Hyundai), Goldstar Electron Co. (Goldstar), and Samsung Electronics Co. (Samsung). The petitioner, Micron Technologies Inc., requested an administrative review of these same three Korean manufacturers of DRAMs. Two interested parties, PNY Electronics and Pulsar Components International, Inc., requested a review of sixteen Japanese resellers of Korean DRAMs. However, these two interested parties subsequently withdrew their request. On June 15, 1994, the Department initiated a review of the above Korean manufacturers (59 FR 30770). The period of review (POR) for all respondents was October 29, 1992, through April 30, 1994.

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). 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 the Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of DRAMs of one megabit and above from the Republic of Korea (Korea). For purposes of this review, DRAMs are all one megabit and above DRAMs, whether assembled or unassembled. Assembled DRAMs include all package types. Unassembled DRAMs include processed wafers, uncut die and cut die. Processed wafers produced in Korea, but packaged, or assembled into memory modules in a third country, are included in the scope; wafers produced in a third country and assembled or packaged in Korea are not included in the scope.

The scope of this review includes memory modules. A memory module is a collection of DRAMs, the sole function of which is memory. Modules include single in-line processing modules (SIPs), single in-line memory modules (SIMMs), or other collections of DRAMs, whether unmounted or mounted on a circuit board. Modules that contain other parts that are needed to support the function of memory are covered. Only those modules which contain additional items which alter the function of the module to something other than memory, such as video graphics adapter (VGA) boards and cards, are not included in the scope.

The scope of this review also includes video random access memory semiconductors (VRAMs), as well as any future packaging and assembling of DRAMs.

The scope of this review also includes removable memory modules placed on motherboards, with or without a central processing unit (CPU), unless the importer of motherboards certifies with the Customs Service that neither it, nor a party related to it or under contract to it, will remove the modules from the motherboards after importation. The scope of this review does not include DRAMs or memory modules that are reimported for repair or replacement.

The DRAMs subject to this review are classifiable under subheadings 8542.11.0001, 8542.11.0024, 8542.11.0026, and 8542.11.0034 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Also included in the scope are those removable Korean DRAMs contained on or within products classifiable under subheadings 8471.91.0000 and 8473.30.4000 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this review remains dispositive.

United States Price

In calculating USP, the Department treated respondents' sales as purchase price, as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, when the merchandise was sold to unrelated U.S. purchasers prior to importation. The Department treated respondents' sales as exporter's sale price (ESP), as defined in section 772(c) of the Act, when the merchandise was sold to unrelated U.S. purchasers after importation.

We calculated purchase price based on packed, f.o.b., f.c.a., or c.i.f. prices to unrelated customers in the United States. We made deductions, where appropriate, for foreign brokerage and handling, foreign inland insurance, air freight, air insurance, U.S. duties, U.S. commissions, discounts, and rebates in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act.

We calculated ESP based on packed, ex-U.S. warehouse prices to unrelated customers in the United States. We made deductions, where appropriate, for discounts, rebates, foreign brokerage and handling, foreign inland insurance, air freight, air insurance, U.S. duties, credit expenses, warranty expenses, royalty payments, U.S. commissions, advertising and promotion expenses, foreign banking charges, U.S. subsidiary packing expenses and U.S. and Korean indirect selling expenses, including inventory carrying costs in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act. For both purchase price and ESP sales, we added duty drawback, where applicable, pursuant to section 772(d)(1)(B) of the Act.

We adjusted USP for taxes in accordance with our practice as outlined in *Siliconmanganese from Venezuela, Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less-Than-Fair-Value (LTFV),* 59 FR 31204 (June 17, 1994). For DRAMs that were further manufactured into memory modules after importation, we deducted all value added in the United States, pursuant to section 772(e)(3) of the Act. The value added consists of the costs of the materials, fabrication, and general expenses associated with the portion of the merchandise further manufactured in the United States, as well as a proportional amount of profit or loss attributable to the value added. *See, e.g., Notice of Final Determination of Sales at LTFV; Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Product, Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Product, Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from France,* 58 FR 37125 (July 9, 1993). Profit or loss was calculated by deducting from the sales price of the memory module all production and selling costs incurred by the company for the memory module. The total profit or loss was then allocated proportionately to all components of cost. Only the profit or loss attributable to the valued added was deducted. In determining the costs incurred to produce the memory module, we included materials, fabrication, and general expenses, including selling expenses and interest expenses. No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

Foreign Market Value

In order to determine whether there were sufficient sales of DRAMs in the

home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating FMV, we compared the volume of home market sales of DRAMs to the volume of third country sales of DRAMs, in accordance with section 773(a)(1) of the Act. All three respondents had viable home markets with respect to sales of DRAMs made during the POR in accordance with 19 CFR 353.48(a). The Department relied on monthly weighted-average home market prices in the calculation of FMV.

Because Goldstar made some home market sales to related parties during the POR, we tested these sales to ensure that, on average, the related party sales were at arms length. To conduct this test, we compared the gross unit prices of sales to related and unrelated customers net of all movement charges, direct and indirect selling expenses, valued-added tax and packing. *See Final Determination of Sales at LTFV; Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Argentina, Appendix II,* 58 FR 87062 (July 9, 1993). Based on the results of that test, we discarded from Goldstar's home market database all related party sales not made at arm's length. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at LTFV; Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel, Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe from Brazil,* 60 FR 31960, 31971 (June 19, 1995).

Because the Department found sales made at prices less than the cost of production (COP) during the less than fair value (LTFV) investigation, in accordance with our standard practice, we found reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that all three respondents had made sales at prices below the COP in the home market during the POR. Thus in accordance with section 773(b) of the Act, we examined whether the home market sales of each model were made at prices below their COP in substantial quantities over an extended period of time, and whether such sales were made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade.

We performed a model-specific COP test, in which we examined whether each home market sale was priced below the merchandise's COP. The Department defines COP as the sum of direct material, direct labor, variable and fixed factory overhead, general expenses, and packaging costs (19 CFR 353.51(c)(1994)). *See Stainless Steel Hollow Products from Sweden; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 59 FR 40521 (August 9, 1994). For each model, we compared this sum to the reported home market unit price, net of price adjustments and movement expenses.

For each model where less than ten percent, by quantity, of the home market sales during the POR were made at prices below the COP, we included all sales of that model in the computation of FMV. For each model where ten percent or more, but less than ninety percent, of the home market sales during the POR were priced below the merchandise's COP, we excluded from the calculation of FMV those home market sales which were priced below the merchandise's COP, provided that these below-cost sales were made over an extended period of time. For each model where ninety percent or more of the home market sales during the POR were priced below the COP and were made over an extended period of time, we disregarded all sales of that model from our analysis. *See Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 60 FR 50670 (April 27, 1995).

In order to determine whether below-cost sales had been made over an extended period of time, we compared the number of months in which below-cost sales occurred for each product to the number of months during the POR in which each model was sold. If a product was sold in fewer than three months during the POR, we did not exclude the below-cost sales unless there were below-cost sales in each month of sale. If a product was sold in three or more months, we did not exclude the below-cost sales unless there were below-cost sales in at least three months during the POR. *Id.*

Finally, respondents did not provide any information, nor is there any information on the record of this proceeding which indicates recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time for sales found to have been made at prices below the cost of production. Therefore, in accordance with our practice, we have disregarded respondents' sales found to have been made at prices below the COP in substantial quantities over an extended period of time, which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade.

We calculated the COP for the merchandise based on the sum of each respondent's material costs, fabrication costs and general expenses in accordance with section 353.51(c) of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.51(c) (1994)). We adjusted respondents' cost data as described below:

For Hyundai, the Department relied on the submitted COP and constructed value (CV) information, except in the following instances where the costs were not appropriately quantified or valued:

1. We reclassified certain capitalized costs from R&D to current costs of production. We recalculated R&D costs to reflect the current costs incurred for all semiconductors.

2. We revised interest expense to reflect the proportional amount incurred by the semiconductor business.

For Goldstar, the Department relied on the submitted COP and CV information, except in the following instances where the costs were not appropriately quantified or valued:

1. We recalculated R&D costs to reflect the current costs incurred for all semiconductors.

For Samsung, the Department relied on the submitted COP and CV information, except in the following instances where the costs were not appropriately quantified or valued:

1. We recalculated R&D costs to reflect the current costs incurred for all semiconductors.

2. We revised interest expense to reflect the proportional amount incurred by the semiconductor business.

When all home market sales of a such or similar product in the contemporaneous month (as identified in the July 19, 1994 model match memorandum) were excluded from our analysis because the home market sales were priced below the COP, or when no home market sales of such or similar merchandise were found, then we used the CV of the merchandise sold in the United States as the basis for FMV in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act. We calculated the CV, in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act, as the sum of the cost of manufacture of the product sold in the United States, home market selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, and home market profit. The cost of manufacture of the product sold in the United States is the sum of direct material, direct labor, and variable and fixed factory overhead expenses. For home market SG&A expenses, in accordance with section 773(e)(B)(i) of our regulations, we used the larger of the actual SG&A expenses reported by the respondents or ten percent of the cost of manufacture, the statutory minimum for foreign SG&A expenses. For home market profit, in accordance with section 773(e)(B)(ii) of our regulations, we used the larger of the actual profit reported by the respondents or the statutory minimum of eight percent of the sum of cost of manufacture and SG&A expenses. *See Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from the Republic of Korea; Preliminary Results of Antidumping*

Duty Administrative Review, 59 FR 35098, 35100 (July 8, 1994).

We calculated FMV based on delivered prices to unrelated customers and, where appropriate, to related customers in the home market. In calculating FMV, we made adjustments, where appropriate, for inland freight, inland insurance, discounts, rebates, Korean brokerage and handling charges, and home market credit expenses. We adjusted for Korean consumption tax in accordance with our practice as outlined in *Siliconmanganese from Venezuela, Preliminary Determination of Sales at LTFV,* 59 FR 31204 (June 17, 1994). We deducted home market packing costs from the home market price and added U.S. packing costs to the FMV. We also made, where applicable, difference-in-merchandise adjustments.

For comparison to purchase price sales, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.56, we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments to the FMV, where appropriate, for bank charges, royalty payments, and advertising. We made further adjustments, where appropriate, for U.S. commissions and credit expenses in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(a)(2). Where commissions were paid on U.S. sales and not paid on home market sales, we allowed an offset to FMV amounting to the lesser of the weighted-average home market indirect selling expenses, or the U.S. commissions in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(b) of our regulations.

For comparison to ESP sales, we made deductions, where appropriate, for credit expenses, royalty payments, bank charges and advertising expenses. We also allowed an ESP offset to the FMV, amounting to the lesser of the weighted-average total of home market indirect selling expenses, or he total U.S. indirect selling expenses plus commissions in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(b)(2).

No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following margins exist for the POR:

Manufacturer/exporter	Percent margin
Hyundai Electronics Co., Ltd. .	0.202 (de minimis)
Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	0.9936 (de minimis)
Goldstar Electron Co., Ltd.	0.319 (de minimis)

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between the USP and the FMV may vary from the percentages stated above. Upon completion of the review the Department will issue appraisement instructions on each exporter directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of dynamic random access memory semiconductors of one megabit and above, assembled or unassembled, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act.

(1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed companies will be those rate established in the preliminary results of this review (except that no deposit will be required for firms with zero or de minimis margins; *i.e.,* margins less than 0.5%);

(2) For previously reviewed or 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 in the original 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) If neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rates will be 3.85%, the ''all other'' rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Interested parties may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice, and may request a hearing within ten days of the date of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held as early as convenient for the parties but not later than 44 days after the date of publication or the first work day thereafter. Case briefs or other written comments from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttal comments, limited to issues in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments.

This notice 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 the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: August 16, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–22501 Filed 9–8–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–05–M

[A–533–806]

Sulfanilic Acid From India: Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Termination of Antidumping Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On April 14, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 19017) the notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from India. This review has now been terminated as a result of a request by the respondents.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 11, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Peterson, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–4195.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 29, 1995, Kokan Synthetics and M/S Kay International (collectively ''Kokan and M/S Kay''), requested an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from India for the period March 1, 1994, through February 28, 1995, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5). On April 14, 1995, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (60