Dated: April 29, 1996.

Linda Engelmeier,

Acting Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 96–11116 Filed 5–3–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DT–P

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 34–96]

Proposed Foreign-Trade Zone—Montgomery, AL; Application and Public Hearing

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the Montgomery Area Chamber of Commerce Inc. (a non-profit organization), requesting authority to establish a general-purpose foreign-trade zone in Montgomery, Alabama, adjacent to the Birmingham Customs port of entry. The application was submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR Part 400). It was formally filed on April 24, 1996. The applicant is authorized to make the proposal under Act No. 498, House Bill 1158, Bound Acts of Alabama, 1977.

The proposed zone would be the third general-purpose zone in the Birmingham Customs port of entry area. The existing zones are: FTZ 98 in Birmingham (Grantee: City of Birmingham; Board Order 247, 49 FR 19367, 5/7/84); and, FTZ 211 in Anniston (Grantee: City of Anniston; Board Order 788 (61 FR 5375, 2/12/96).

The proposed zone would consists of 2 sites (5,725 acres) in Montgomery: *Site 1* (5,170 acres, Airport Site)—located on Interstate 65 on the south side of Montgomery; and, *Site 2* (555 acres)—Gunter Industrial Park, adjacent to the northern Bypass, Montgomery. Site 1 is comprised of the City's Dannelly Field Municipal Airport (1,968 acres), the adjacent Interstate Enterprise Zone industrial development area (3,024 acres) owned by ALFA, the Industrial Development Board of the City of Montgomery and the privately-owned adjoining Catoma Industrial Park (178 acres). The Chamber will be responsible for the marketing and development of the zone project.

The application contains evidence of the need for zone services in the Montgomery area. Several firms have indicated an interest in using zone procedures for warehousing/distribution of such items as electronic equipment, corrugated boxes, telephone equipment and plastic products. Specific manufacturing approvals are not being sought at this time. Request would be made to the Board on a case-by-case basis.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

As part of the investigation, the Commerce examiner will hold a public hearing on May 30, 1996, 1:00 p.m., Montgomery Area Chamber of Commerce, 41 Commerce Street, Montgomery, Alabama.

Public comment on the application is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is July 5, 1996. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to July 22, 1996).

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available during this time for public inspection at the following locations:

Montgomery Area Chamber of Commerce 41 Commerce Street Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 3716, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: April 25, 1996.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–11120 Filed 5–3–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

International Trade Administration

[A–428–602]

Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent To Revoke Order in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent to Revoke Order in Part.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by the respondent, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on brass sheet and strip from Germany. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of this merchandise to the United States, Wieland-Werke AG (Wieland). The period covered is March 1, 1994 through February 28, 1995. As a result of the review, the Department has preliminarily determined that no dumping margins exist for this respondent. We intend to revoke the order with respect to brass sheet and strip from Germany manufactured by Wieland, based on our preliminary determination that Wieland has had a three-year period of no or *de minimis* sales at less than foreign market value.

We invite interested parties 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: May 6, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Killiam or John Kugelman, 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) 482–2704 or 482–0649, respectively.

Applicable Statute

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).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 6, 1987, the Department published in the Federal Register (52 FR 6997) the antidumping duty order on brass sheet and strip from Germany. The Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order for the 1994–1995 period on March 7, 1995 (60 FR 12540). On March 31, 1995, we received a request for review from Wieland covering the period March 1, 1994 through February 28, 1995. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on April 14, 1995 (60 FR 19017).

As explained in the memoranda from the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration dated November 22, 1995, and January 11, 1996, all

deadlines were extended to take into account the partial shutdowns of the Federal Government from November 15 through November 21, 1995 and December 15, 1995, through January 6, 1996. Therefore, the deadline for these preliminary results is no later than April 29, 1996, and the deadline for the final results of review is no later than August 27, 1996.

The Department is now conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are sales or entries of brass sheet and strip, other than leaded and tinned brass sheet and strip. The chemical composition of the products under review is currently defined in the Copper Development Association (C.D.A.) 200 Series or the Unified Numbering System (U.N.S.) C20000 series. This review does not cover products for which the chemical compositions are defined by other C.D.A. or U.N.S. series. The merchandise is currently classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 7409.21.00 and 7409.29.20. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The review period is March 1, 1994 through February 28, 1995. The review involves one manufacturer/ exporter, Wieland.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Tariff Act, we verified information provided by the respondent, Wieland, by using our standard verification procedures, including 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.

Intent To Revoke

Wieland submitted a request, in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 353.25(b), to revoke the order covering brass sheet and strip from Germany with respect to Wieland's sales of this merchandise.

In accordance with 19 C.F.R. 353.25(a)(2)(iii), this request was accompanied by certifications from the firm that it had not sold the relevant class or kind of merchandise at less than normal value (NV) for a three-year period including this review period, and would not do so in the future. Wieland also agreed to its immediate reinstatement in the relevant antidumping duty order, as long as any firm is subject to this order, if the Department concludes under 19 C.F.R. 353.22(f) that, subsequent to revocation, it sold the subject merchandise at less than NV.

In the two prior reviews of this order, we determined that Wieland did not sell brass sheet and strip from Germany at less than foreign market value. The Department conducted a verification of Wieland's response for this period of review. In this review, we preliminarily determine that Wieland has not sold brass sheet and strip from Germany at less than NV in the United States. Therefore, we intend to revoke the order with respect to Wieland's sales of this merchandise, if these preliminary findings are affirmed in our final results.

United States Price (USP)

In calculating USP for Wieland, we used export price (EP), as defined in section 772 of the Act, because the merchandise was sold to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of importation and because no other circumstances indicated that constructed export price was appropriate. We calculated EP based on prices that were delivered to the customers' premises. In accordance with section 772(c)(1) of the Act, we adjusted USP, less early payment discounts, for brokerage and handling, foreign and U.S. inland freight, and customs duty. We did not adjust for packing expense, which was included in reported U.S. prices.

No other adjustments to EP were claimed or allowed.

Normal Value

A. Viability

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 Wieland'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)(B) of the Act. Because Wieland'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 of the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market provides a viable basis for calculating NV for Wieland.

B. Model-Matching

We calculated NV using prices of sales of brass sheet having the same characteristics as to form, coat, gauge, width, and alloy. We used the same gauge and width groupings and the same model-match methodology in this review as in the last completed administrative reviews (1990–1994).

C. Price-to-Price Comparisons

We calculated NV using monthly weighted-average prices of brass sheet and strip having the same characteristics as to form, coat, gauge, width, and alloy. We based NV on the price at which the foreign like product is first sold for consumption in the exporting country, in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade, and at the same level of trade as the export price, as defined by section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act.

We reduced NV for early payment discounts and credit, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii), due to differences in circumstances of sale. We reduced NV for movement expenses, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii), and for packing costs incurred in the home market, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(B)(i). We increased NV for export packing costs, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A), and for U.S. credit expenses, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. We added to NV adjustments for physical differences in the merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act.

No other adjustments to NV were claimed or allowed.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of our comparison of EP to NV, we preliminarily determine that a zero dumping margin exists for Wieland for the period 3/1/94–2/28/95.

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing will be held 44 days after the date of publication or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the publication date of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such case briefs or at a hearing.

The following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise that are 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 Wieland will be the rate established in the final results of this

review. (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, 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. (4) If neither the manufacturer nor the exporter is a firm covered in this or any previous review, the cash deposit rate will be 8.87 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

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 this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: April 26, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–11122 Filed 5–3–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–580–812]

Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit or Above From the Republic of Korea; 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 September 11, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on dynamic random access memory semiconductors (DRAMS) of one megabit or above from the Republic of Korea. The review covers two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States for the period October 29, 1992 through April 30, 1994. These manufacturers/exporters are LG Semicon Co., Ltd. (LGS, formerly Goldstar Electron Co., Ltd.) and Hyundai Electronics Industries, Inc. (HEI/Hyundai).

As a result of comments we received, the antidumping margins have changed from those we presented in our preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 6, 1996.

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, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–3814.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 11, 1995, the Department published the preliminary results (60 FR 47149) of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on DRAMS of one megabit or above from the Republic of Korea. We received timely comments from the petitioner and both respondents. At the request of the petitioner, we held a hearing on October 26, 1995.

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, 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 of this review.

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 provides for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this review remains dispositive.

The period of review (POR) covers from October 29, 1992 through April 30, 1994 for all respondents.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Action 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations refer to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

United States Price

We calculated U.S. price according to the methodology described in our preliminary results, except for the adjustment of value-added taxes (VAT), as described below.

In light of the Federal Circuit's decision in *Federal Mogul* v. *United States*, 63 F. 3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995), the Department has changed its treatment of home market consumption taxes. Where merchandise exported to the United States is exempt from the consumption tax, the Department will add to the U.S. price the absolute amount of such taxes charged on the comparison sales in the home market. This is the same methodology that the Department adopted following the decision of the Federal Circuit in *Zenith*