Signed at Washington, DC, this 23rd day of May 1997.

Jeffrey Bialos,

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

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–14480 Filed 6–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 42–97]

Foreign-Trade Zone 46—Cincinnati, Ohio, Area; Application for Expansion and Request for Manufacturing Authority, Cincinnati Milacron, Inc. (Horizontal Turning and Grinding Machinery and Related Consumable Products)

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the Greater Cincinnati Foreign Trade Zone, Inc., grantee of FTZ 46, requesting authority to expand its zone at the Oakley Industrial Complex, and requesting, on behalf of Cincinnati Milacron, Inc., authority to manufacture horizontal turning and grinding machinery and metalworking consumable products under zone procedures within FTZ 46, Cincinnati, Ohio, area, within the Cincinnati 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 May 23, 1997.

FTZ 46 was approved on January 12, 1979 (Board Order 141, 44 FR 4003; 1/19/79) and relocated on December 19, 1994 (Board Order 720, 59 FR 66891; 12/28/94). The zone currently consists of 35 acres at 175 Progress Place in Springdale (Hamilton County), Ohio, some 17 miles north of downtown Cincinnati.

The applicant is now requesting authority to expand the zone by adding a site (122 acres–5 parcels) located at 4701 Marburg Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio. The new site is owned by Cincinnati Milacron (CM), which will serve as operator of the site.

The application also requests authority on behalf of CM to manufacture horizontal turning and grinding machinery and metalworking consumable products under zone procedures at the Marburg Avenue facilities within the proposed expansion site of FTZ 46. The facilities (99 acres/2,450 employees) are used to produce computer-numerically-controlled horizontal turning and grinding (metal working) machines (horizontal machining centers/lathes, composites processing machines, flexible manufacturing cells, grinding machines; duty rates: 4.2, 4.4%) and consumable products used in metalworking (grinding wheels, soluble oil metal working fluids; duty rate: 1.5%). Components purchased from abroad (up to 29% of finished product value) include: lamps, oscilloscopes, chemical analysis instruments, wire and cables, electrical boards/panels, numerical process controllers, printed circuit assemblies, electrical apparatus, AC/DC motors, transformers, gears, flywheels, clutches, shaft couplings, pulleys, bearings (roller/ball), valves, parts of plastic/rubber forming machines, injection molding machines, parts of machine tools, parts of automatic data processing machines, spray guns, parts of centrifuges, filtering/purifying machines, heat exchange units, fans, pumps, linear acting engines, parts of nuclear reactors, fasteners, chain, wire ropes/cables, tubes/pipes and fittings, hoses, abrasive wheels, transfers, articles of plastic, oil seals, gaskets, conveyor/transmission belts, cements/mortars, and resins (1997 duty rates: free – 9.8%, 9.2¢/kg+2.4%). Foreign items used in the manufacture of metal working consumable products include grinding wheels, abrasives, diamond dressing, refractory ceramic goods, refractometers, cubic boron nitrate, silicon carbide, artificial corundum, glass frit, phenolic resins, epoxy resins, clay, furfuryl alcohol, and fiberglass reinforcements (1997 duty rates: free – 7.1%, .07¢/kg+2.8%). Some 15 percent of the finished machines are exported.

FTZ procedures would exempt CM from Customs duty payments on the foreign components used in export production. On its domestic sales, CM would be able to choose the duty rates that apply to finished turning and grinding machinery and metalworking consumable products for the foreign components noted above. CM would also defer duty payments on foreign-origin finished vertical turning and grinding machinery admitted to the proposed subzone. FTZ procedures would also exempt certain merchandise from state/local ad valorem inventory taxes. The application indicates that the savings from FTZ procedures would help improve CM's international competitiveness.

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.

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 August 4, 1997. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to August 18, 1997).

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

U.S. Department of Commerce, Export Assistance Center, 36 East 7th St., Suite 2650, Cincinnati, OH 45202.

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

Dated: May 23, 1997.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–14479 Filed 6–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–583–815]

Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe From Taiwan, Initiation of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of initiation of changed circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from Chang Mien Industries Co., Ltd. (Chang Mien), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is initiating a changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded stainless steel pipe from Taiwan. See Notice of Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipes From Taiwan, 59 FR 6619 (February 11, 1994); see also Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe From Taiwan, 57 FR 62300 (December 30, 1992). Chang Mien requested that the Department

determine that Chang Mien is the successor firm to Chang Tieh Industry Co., Ltd. (Chang Tieh), a respondent in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation. The Department excluded Chang Tieh from the antidumping duty order on certain welded stainless steel pipe from Taiwan after calculating a margin of zero for Chang Tieh. See Notice of Amended Final Determination, 59 FR 6619. Chang Mien maintains that, as Chang Mien and Chang Tieh were related at the time of the LTFV investigation, Chang Mien was entitled to Chang Tieh's exclusion from the order *ab initio.* Chang Mien further states that, since publication of the order, Chang Mien has absorbed Chang Tieh, and asks that the Department issue a determination that Chang Mien is the successor firm to Chang Tieh and is, therefore, entitled to Chang Tieh's exclusion from the antidumping duty order. Chang Mien's request is filed pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

We are initiating an antidumping duty changed circumstances administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded stainless steel pipe from Taiwan to determine whether or not Chang Mien is the successor firm to respondent Chang Tieh, and to determine whether Chang Mien is entitled to Chang Tieh's exclusion from the order.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 4, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert M. James at (202) 482–5222, or John Kugelman at (202) 482–0649, AD/CVD Enforcement Office Eight, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230.

The 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 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).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 11, 1996, Chang Mien requested that the Department conduct a changed circumstances administrative review pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act to determine whether Chang Mien should properly be considered the successor firm to Chang Tieh and if, as such, Chang Mien should be excluded from the antidumping duty order. Chang Mien, on September 19, 1996, requested that the Department publish its preliminary results concurrently with this notice of initiation, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(f)(4). Citing the Department's September 17, 1996 notice of initiation and preliminary results of changed circumstances review in sugar and syrups from Canada, Chang Mien argues that the instant case is, like the sugar case, ''legally and factually straightforward'' and requested that the Department find that ''Chang Mien has provided *prima facie* evidence . . . that Chang Mien and its affiliated companies should be excluded from the instant [antidumping duty] order.'' Chang Mien's Letter to the Secretary, September 19, 1996 at 2; see also, Sugar and Syrups From Canada; Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 61 FR 48885 (September 17, 1996).

In a letter submitted on September 25, 1996, petitioners [1] objected to Chang Mien's request for an expedited review pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act. Petitioners assert that the factual and legal bases in the instant case are substantially different than in Sugars and Syrups from Canada, and that this case will require ''caution and close review'' prior to issuing any determination. See Petitioners' Letter of September 25, 1996 at 5.

The Department has examined Chang Mien's request for a changed circumstances administrative review and has determined that the facts before the Department in the instant case will require further investigation. The Department further concludes that it would be inappropriate to issue a preliminary determination prior to conducting this investigation. Therefore, the Department is not issuing preliminary results of its changed circumstances administrative review at this time. See Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa, January 10, 1997, on file in Room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building.

Scope of the Review

The merchandise subject to this antidumping duty order is welded austenitic stainless steel pipe (WSSP) that meets the standards and specifications set forth by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) for the welded form of chromium-nickel pipe designated ASTM A–312. The merchandise covered by the scope of this order also includes austenitic welded stainless steel pipes made according to the standards of other nations which are comparable to ASTM A–312.

WSSP is produced by forming stainless steel flat-rolled products into a tubular configuration and welding along the seam. WSSP is a commodity product generally used as a conduit to transmit liquids or gases. Major applications include, but are not limited to, digester lines, blow lines, pharmaceutical lines, petrochemical stock lines, brewery process and transport lines, general food processing lines, automotive paint lines and paper process machines. Imports of WSSP are currently classifiable under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) subheadings: 7306.40.5005, 7306.40.5015, 7306.40.5040, 7306.40.5065 and 7306.40.5085. Although these subheadings include both pipes and tubes, the scope of this antidumping duty order is limited to welded austenitic stainless steel pipes. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

This changed circumstances administrative review covers Chang Mien, Chang Tieh, and any parties affiliated with Chang Mien or Chang Tieh.

Initiation of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

Pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act, the Department will conduct a changed circumstances administrative review upon receipt of information concerning, or a request from an interested party for a review of, an antidumping duty order which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of the order. See section 751(b)(1). Therefore, in accordance with section 751(b) and 19 CFR 353.22(f)(1)(i), we are initiating a changed circumstances administrative review based upon the factual information and argument contained in Chang Mien's September 11, 1996 request for this review.

The Department will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(f)(1)(v), which will set forth the factual and legal conclusions upon which our preliminary results are based.

[1] Petitioners are: Avesta Sheffield, Inc., Bristol Metals, Inc., Damascus Tube Division, Damascus-Bishop Tube Co., Trent Tube Division, Crucible Materials Corp., and the United Steelworkers of America (AFL-CIO/CLC).

Not later than 270 days after publication of this Notice of Initiation, the Department will issue its final results of review, and will publish these results in the **Federal Register**. All written comments must be submitted in accordance with 19 CFR 353.31(e) and must be served on all interested parties on the Department's service list in accordance with 19 CFR 353.31(g).

This notice is in accordance with section 751(b)(1) of the Tariff Act and section 353.22(f)(1)(i) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: May 15, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–14482 Filed 6–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of initiation of process to revoke Export Trade Certificate of Review No. 95–00004.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Commerce issued an export trade certificate of review to UPA, Inc. Because this certificate holder has failed to file an annual report as required by law, the Department is initiating proceedings to revoke the certificate. This notice summarizes the notification letter sent to UPA, Inc.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: W. Dawn Busby, Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, (202) 482–5131. This is not a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (''the Act'') (15 U.S.C. 4011–21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue export trade certificates of review. The regulations implementing Title III (''the Regulations'') are found at 15 CFR part 325. Pursuant to this authority, a certificate of review was issued on August 18, 1995 to UPA, Inc.

A certificate holder is required by law (Section 308 of the Act, 15 U.S.C. 4018) to submit to the Department of Commerce annual reports that update financial and other information relating to business activities covered by its certificate. The annual report is due within 45 days after the anniversary date of the issuance of the certificate of review (Sections 325.14(a) and (b) of the Regulations). Failure to submit a complete annual report may be the basis for revocation (Section 325.10(a) of the Regulations).

The Department of Commerce sent to UPA, Inc. on February 12, 1997, a letter containing annual report questions with a reminder that its annual report was due by October 2, 1996. Additional reminders were sent on April 11, 1997, and on May 2, 1997. The Department has received no response to any of these letters.

On May 27, 1997, and in accordance with Section 325.10 (c)(1) of the Regulations, a letter was sent by certified mail to notify UPA, Inc. that the Department was formally initiating the process to revoke its certificate. The letter stated that this action is being taken because of the certificate holder's failure to file an annual report.

In accordance with Section 325.10(c)(2) of the Regulations, each certificate holder has thirty days from the day after its receipt of the notification letter in which to respond. The certificate holder is deemed to have received this letter as of the date on which this notice is published in the **Federal Register**. For good cause shown, the Department of Commerce can, at its discretion, grant a thirty-day extension for a response.

If the certificate holder decides to respond, it must specifically address the Department's statement in the notification letter that it has failed to file an annual report. It should state in detail why the facts, conduct, or circumstances described in the notification letter are not true, or if they are, why they do not warrant revoking the certificate. If the certificate holder does not respond within the specified period, it will be considered an admission of the statements contained in the notification letter (Section 325.10(c)(2) of the Regulations).

If the answer demonstrates that the material facts are in dispute, the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice shall, upon request, meet informally with the certificate holder. Either Department may require the certificate holder to provide the documents or information that are necessary to support its contentions (Section 325.10(c)(3) of the Regulations).

The Department shall publish a notice in the **Federal Register** of the revocation or modification or a decision not to revoke or modify (Section 325.10(c)(4) of the Regulations). If there is a determination to revoke a certificate, any person aggrieved by such final decision may appeal to an appropriate U.S. district court within 30 days from the date on which the Department's final determination is published in the **Federal Register** (Sections 325.10(c)(4) and 325.11 of the Regulations).

Dated: May 27, 1997.

W. Dawn Busby,

Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs.

[FR Doc. 97–14521 Filed 6–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Notice of Scope Rulings

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

ACTION: Notice of scope rulings and anticircumvention inquiries.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) hereby publishes a list of scope rulings and anticircumvention inquiries completed by Import Administration, between January 1, 1997, and March 31, 1997. In conjunction with this list, the Department is also publishing a list of pending requests for scope clarifications and anticircumvention inquiries. The Department intends to publish future lists within 30 days of the end of each quarter.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 4, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ronald M. Trentham, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4793.

Background

The Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.29(d)(8) and 355.29(d)(8)) provide that on a quarterly basis the Secretary will publish in the **Federal Register** a list of scope rulings completed within the last three months.

This notice lists scope rulings and anticircumvention inquiries completed by Import Administration, between January 1, 1997, and March 31, 1997, and pending scope clarification and anticircumvention inquiry requests. The Department intends to publish in July 1997 a notice of scope rulings and anticircumvention inquiries completed between April 1, 1997, and June 30, 1997, as well as pending scope clarification and anticircumvention inquiry requests.

The following lists provide the country, case reference number, requester(s), and a brief description of