(nonprivileged foreign status—NPF) on certain petrochemical feedstocks and refinery by-products (duty-free). The duty on crude oil ranges from 5.25¢ to 10.5¢/barrel. The application indicates that the savings from zone procedures would help improve the refinery's international competitiveness.

In accordance with the Board's regulations (as revised, 56 FR 50790–50808, 10–8–91), a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment 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, 1995. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to August 21, 1975).

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 District Office, 3131 Princeton Pike, Bldg. #6, Suite 100, Trenton, NJ 08648

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

Dated: May 26, 1995.

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–13701 Filed 6–2–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

International Trade Administration

[A–588–038]

Bicycle Speedometers From Japan; 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 January 31, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping finding on bicycle speedometers from Japan. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter, Cateye Co., Ltd. (Cateye), and the period November 1, 1992 through October 31, 1993.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received comments from the respondent, Cateye. Based on our analysis of the comments received, the final results of this review have changed from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 5, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Arthur N. DuBois or Thomas F. Futtner, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–6312/3814.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 31, 1995, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 5898) the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping finding on bicycle speedometers from Japan (37 FR 24826, November 22, 1972). On February 27, 1995, we received comments from the respondent, Cateye. The Department has now completed that administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of bicycle speedometers. This merchandise is currently classifiable under the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (HTS) item numbers 9029.20.20, 9029.40.80, and 9029.90.40. HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. Our written description remains dispositive.

The review covers the shipments of Cateye, a manufacturer/exporter of bicycle speedometers during the period November 1, 1992 through October 31, 1993.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results as provided by section 353.38 of the Department's regulations. We received comments from the respondent, Cateye.

Comment 1: Cateye commented that in the preliminary calculations the Department inappropriately included sales in the home market data base that occurred outside the period of review.

Department's Response: We agree and have corrected the programming accordingly.

Comment 2: Cateye commented that for certain models sold in the United States, we failed to compare the most similar merchandise sold in the home market.

Department's Response: We agree that for the models mentioned in Cateye's comment, we failed to compare models sold in the United States with the most similar merchandise sold in the home market. The most similar merchandise for models with black cases sold in the United States are home market models with black cases, and the most similar merchandise for models with colored cases sold in the United States are home market models with colored cases. We have recalculated our results accordingly.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we have determined that the following margin exists for the period November 1, 1992 through October 31, 1993:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Cateye Co., Ltd	1.44

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between U.S. price and foreign market value may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results of administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after that publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act, and will remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be 1.44 percent;

(2) for exporters not covered in this review, but covered in previous reviews or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, 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 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, the cash deposit rate will be 26.44 percent, which is the ''new shipper'' rate established in the first administrative review in accordance with the Court of International Trade's (CIT's) decisions in *Floral Trade Council* v. *United States,* 822 F. Supp. 766 (CIT 1993), and *Federal Mogul Corporation and the Torrington Company* v. *the United States,* 822 F Supp. 782 (CIT 1993). We are basing the ''all others'' rate on the ''new

shipper'' rate established in the first final results of administrative review published by the Department (47 FR 28978, July 2, 1982) because this proceeding is governed by an antidumping finding, and we are unable to ascertain the ''all others'' rate from the Treasury LTFV investigation.

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 has occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) 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 return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)), and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: May 26, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–13702 Filed 6–2–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–549–813]

Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Canned Pineapple Fruit From Thailand

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 5, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michelle Frederick or Jennifer Katt, 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) 482–0186 or 482–0498, respectively.

Final Determination

We determine that imports of canned pineapple fruit (CPF) from Thailand are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the ''Act'') (1994). The estimated weighted-average margins are shown in the ''Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation'' section of this notice.

Case History

Since our affirmative preliminary determination and postponement of the final determination on January 4, 1995 (60 FR 2734, January 11, 1995) (*Preliminary Determination*), the following events have occurred:

On January 20, 1995, Maui Pineapple Company, Ltd. and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (the petitioners) alleged a ministerial error in the Department's preliminary determination calculations regarding Dole Food Company, Inc., Dole Packaged Foods Company, and Dole Thailand, Ltd. (collectively Dole). The error was found to constitute a significant ministerial error because the correction resulted in a difference between a dumping margin of *de minimis* and a margin greater than *de minimis*. *See* § 353.15(g)(4)(ii) of the Department's Proposed Regulations (57 FR 1131, January 10, 1992). An amended preliminary determination was issued on February 14, 1995 (60 FR 9820, February 22, 1995).

The four respondents in this investigation, Dole, The Thai Pineapple Public Co., Ltd. (TIPCO), Siam Agro Industry Pineapple and Others Co., Ltd. (SAICO), and Malee Sampran Factory Public Co., Ltd. (Malee), submitted revisions to their responses, and/or revised computer tapes that corrected clerical errors discovered at verification in January, February, March and April 1995.

We conducted verifications of TIPCO, SAICO and Malee's sales and cost questionnaire responses in Thailand in February and March 1995. Verifications of Dole's sales and cost responses were conducted in Belgium, Thailand, Hong Kong, and the United States in January, February and March 1995.

Dole, TIPCO, SAICO, Malee and the petitioners submitted case briefs on April 26, 1995, and rebuttal briefs on May 3, 1995. At the request of both the petitioners and Dole, a public hearing was held on May 10, 1995.

Scope of the Investigation

The product covered by this investigation is canned pineapple fruit (CPF). For the purposes of this investigation, CPF is defined as pineapple processed and/or prepared into various product forms, including rings, pieces, chunks, tidbits, and crushed pineapple, that is packed and cooked in metal cans with either pineapple juice or sugar syrup added. CPF is currently classifiable under subheadings 2008.20.0010 and 2008.20.0090 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). HTSUS 2008.20.0010 covers CPF packed in a sugar-based syrup; HTSUS 2008.20.0090 covers CPF packed without added sugar (*i.e.*, juice-packed). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation (''POI'') is January 1 through June 30, 1994, for TIPCO, SAICO and Malee; and January 2 through June 18, 1994, for Dole (*see* Memorandum from Gary Taverman to Barbara R. Stafford, dated August 18, 1994).

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.

Such or Similar Comparisons

We have determined that all products covered by this investigation constitute a single category of such or similar merchandise. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the third country market [1] to compare to U.S. sales, we made similar merchandise comparisons on the basis of the criteria defined in Appendix V to the antidumping questionnaire, on file in Room B–099 of the main building of the Department of Commerce. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.58, we made comparisons at the same level of trade, where possible. Where we were not able to match sales at the same level of trade, we made comparisons across levels of trade.

Based on the functional differences between Dole's U.S. and German customers, we continue to consider Dole's sales of CPF to be made at two distinct levels of trade in both the U.S. and German markets. (*See Preliminary Determination* and Import Administration Policy Bulletin 92/1, dated July 29, 1992.) The first level is comprised of sales to customers in the retail and food service sectors (Level I); the second is comprised of sales to customers in the industrial sector (Level II).

[1] Third country markets were used because none of the four respondents had a viable home market.