regulations, including § 400.28, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Foreign status (19 CFR §§ 146.41, 146.42) products consumed as fuel for the refinery shall be subject to the applicable duty rate.

2. Privileged foreign status (19 CFR § 146.41) shall be elected on all foreign merchandise admitted to the subzone, except that non-privileged foreign (NPF) status (19 CFR § 146.42) may be elected on refinery inputs covered under HTSUS Subheadings # 2709.00.1000–#2710.00.1050 and # 2710.00.2500 which are used in the production of:

—Petrochemical feedstocks and refinery by-products (examiners report, Appendix D);
—Products for export; and,
—Products eligible for entry under HTSUS # 9808.00.30 and 9808.00.40 (U.S. Government purchases).

3. The authority with regard to the NPF option is initially granted until September 30, 2000, subject to extension.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of October 1995.

Susan G. Esserman

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

Attest:

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–26334 Filed 10–23–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[Order No. 782]

Revision of Grant of Authority, Subzone 122A, Coastal Refining and Marketing, Inc. (Oil Refinery), 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, the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) authorized subzone status at the oil refinery of Coastal Refining and Marketing, Inc., in Corpus Christi, Texas, in 1985 (Subzone 122A), Board Order 310, 50 FR 38020, 9/19/85);

Whereas, the Port of Corpus Christi Authority, grantee of FTZ 122, has requested, pursuant to § 400.32(b)(1)(i), a revision (filed 8/18/95, A(32b1)–16–95; FTZ Doc. 56–95, assigned 9/27/95) of the grant of authority for FTZ Subzone 122A which would make its scope of authority identical to that recently granted for FTZ Subzone 199A at the refinery complex of Amoco Oil Company, Texas City, Texas (Board Order 731, 60 FR 13118, 3/10/95); and,

Whereas, the request has been reviewed and the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, acting for the Board pursuant to § 400.32(b)(1), concurs in the recommendation of the Executive Secretary, and approves the request;

Now Therefore, the Board hereby orders that, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28, Board Order 310 is revised to include the following conditions:

1. Foreign status (19 CFR §§ 146.41, 146.42) products consumed as fuel for the refinery (Subzone 122A) shall be subject to the applicable duty rate.

2. Privileged foreign status (19 CFR § 146.41) shall be elected on all foreign merchandise admitted to Subzone 122A, except that non-privileged foreign (NPF) status (19 CFR § 146.42) may be elected on refinery inputs covered under HTSUS Subheadings #2709.00.1000–#2710.00.1050 and #2710.00.2500 which are used in the production of:

—Petrochemical feedstocks and refinery by-products (FTZ staff report, Appendix B);
—Products for export; and,
—Products eligible for entry under HTSUS #9808.00.30 and 9808.00.40 (U.S. Government purchases).

3. The authority with regard to the NPF option for Subzone 122A is initially granted until September 30, 2000, subject to extension.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of October 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

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

Attest:

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–26336 Filed 10–23–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

International Trade Administration

[A–570–839]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Partial-Extension Steel Drawer Slides with Rollers From the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 24, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Brinkmann, Michelle Frederick or Sunkyu Kim, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5288, (202) 482–0186 or (202) 482–2613, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

Final Determination

We determine that certain partial-extension steel drawer slides with rollers (drawer slides) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). The estimated margins are shown in the ''Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation'' section of this notice.

Case History

Since the preliminary determination of sales at LTFV on May 30, 1995 (60 FR 29571, June 5, 1995), the following events have occurred:

On June 8, 1995, the three respondents, Guangdong Metals and Minerals Import and Export Group Corporation (GDMC), Taiming Metal Products Co., Ltd. (Taiming), and Sikai Hardware & Electronic Equipment Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (SHEEM), jointly submitted clerical error allegations to the Department's preliminary determination. While the Department found that a clerical error was made in the preliminary determination for GDMC, because the clerical error was not significant, as defined in 19 CFR 353.15, no revision to the preliminary determination was made.

On June 15, 1995, Tung Wing (Hardware) Industrial Company submitted a letter to the Department stating that it is a manufacturer of the subject merchandise in the PRC and gave notice of appearance as an interested party. It also requested a public hearing in this investigation. On the same day, three interested parties, Liberty Hardware Mfg. Corp., Armstrong Furniture, and Sauder Woodworking also requested a public hearing.

Additional publicly available published information on surrogate values was submitted by the petitioner and the respondents on July 6 and 10, 1995, respectively. The petitioner also submitted pre-verification comments on

July 6, 1995. The respondents submitted information on steel scrap offsets on July 10, 1995.

In July and August 1995, we verified the respondents' questionnaire responses. Reports concerning these verifications were issued in August 1995. On August 22, 1995, the respondents submitted a letter requesting that a public hearing not be held. The petitioner as well as the interested parties, Liberty Hardware Mfg. Corp., Armstrong Furniture, and Sauder Woodworking, also agreed that a public hearing should not be held. On August 31, 1995, Tung Wing (Hardware) Industrial Company withdrew its request for a public hearing.

The petitioner and the respondents filed case briefs on September 1, 1995, and rebuttal briefs on September 11, 1995. On September 5, 1995, the respondents submitted a letter requesting that the Department reject the petitioner's case brief in its entirety claiming that it contained new factual information. Specifically, the respondents objected to petitioner's submission of information regarding the type of rivets used in making drawer slides. The petitioner submitted rebuttal comments to the respondents' request on September 8, 1995. After reviewing petitioner's submission and the record in this investigation, the Department has determined that the information regarding rivets as submitted by the petitioner in the case brief did not constitute new factual information (*see,* Memorandum to File from Case Analyst dated September 11, 1995).

On September 6, 1995, we requested that each respondent submit revised computer files incorporating corrections found at verification. On September 16, 1995, we received revised computer files from each respondent.

Scope of Investigation

The subject merchandise in this investigation is certain partial-extension steel drawer slides of any length with rollers. A drawer slide is composed of two separate drawer slide rails. Each rail has screw holes and an attached polymer roller. The polymer roller may or may not have ball bearings. The subject drawer slides come in two models: European or Low-Profile and Over-Under or High-Profile. The former model has two opposing rails that provide one channel along which both rollers move and the latter has two opposing rails that provide two channels, one for each roller. For both models of drawer slides, the two opposing rails differ slightly in shape depending on whether the rail is to be affixed to the side of a cabinet or the side of a drawer. A rail may also feature a flange for affixing to or aligning along the bottom of a drawer.

Drawer slides may be packaged in an assembly pack with two drawer slides; that is, four rails with their attached rollers, or in an assembly pack with one drawer slide; that is, two rails with their attached rollers; or individually; as a drawer slide rail with its attached roller. An assembly pack may or may not contain a packet of screws.

Not included in the scope of this investigation are linear ball bearing steel drawer slides (with ball bearing in a linear plane between the steel elements of the slide), roller bearing drawer slides (with roller bearings in the wheel), metal box drawer slides (slides built into the side of a metal or aluminum drawer), full extension drawer slides (with more than four rails per pair), and industrial slides (customized, high-precision slides without polymer rollers).

The subject merchandise is currently classifiable under subheading 8302.42.30 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). It may also be classified under 9403.90.80. Although the HTSUS subheading is 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 May 1, 1994, through October 31, 1994.

Best Information Available

As stated in the preliminary determination, we have based the duty deposit rate for all other exporters in the PRC (the ''PRC-Wide Rate'') on best information available (''BIA''). The evidence on record indicates that the responding companies do not account for all exports of the subject merchandise. On January 19, 1995, the Department sent full questionnaires to the PRC's Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation (MOFTEC) and the China Chamber of Commerce for Machinery and Electronics Products Importers/Exporters (the Chamber). The Department requested that the questionnaire be transmitted to all companies that produce drawer slides for export to the United States and to all companies that exported drawer slides to the United States during the POI. Although requested, the Department never received confirmation that either MOFTEC or the Chamber had forwarded the questionnaire.

The evidence on record indicates that not all producers of drawer slides for export to the United States or exporters of drawer slides to the United States responded to our questionnaire. Specifically, the petitioner has provided in the petition, submitted on October 31, 1994, price quotes on drawer slides obtained from a non-respondent PRC company. Additionally, on February 17, 1995, the Department received a phone call from a U.S. importer of drawer slides from the PRC. The importer indicated that the PRC exporter from which he buys drawer slides was not identified by the petitioner or the Department (*see,* preliminary determination concurrence memorandum of May 30, 1995). Also, as stated above in the *Case History,* Tung Wing (Hardware) Industrial Company has identified itself as a manufacturer of drawer slides in the PRC in a letter submitted to the Department on June 15, 1995.

Because information has not been presented to the Department to prove otherwise, other PRC exporters not participating in this investigation are not entitled to separate dumping margins. In the absence of responses from all exporters, therefore, we are basing the country-wide deposit rate on BIA, pursuant to section 776(c) of the Act. (*See, e.g., Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Pure Magnesium From Ukraine,* 61 FR 16433 (March 30, 1995) (''*Pure Magnesium from Ukraine*'')).

In determining what to use as BIA, the Department follows a two-tiered methodology, whereby the Department normally assigns margins based on less adverse assumptions to those respondents who cooperated in an investigation and margins based on more adverse assumptions for those respondents who did not cooperate in an investigation. *See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Sweden, Thailand and the United Kingdom,* 54 FR 18992, 19033 (May 3, 1989). When a company refuses to provide the information requested in the form required, or otherwise significantly impedes the Department's investigation, the Department assigns to that company the higher of (a) the highest margin alleged in the petition, or (b) the highest calculated rate of any respondent in the investigation.

In this investigation, because the evidence indicates that not all PRC exporters of drawer slides responded to our questionnaire, we are assigning to any PRC company, other than those specifically identified below, the PRC-Wide deposit rate. In this investigation,

that rate is the highest margin alleged in the petition, as recalculated by the Department for purposes of the initiation, because it is higher than the highest calculated rate of any respondent. (*See Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Certain Partial-Extension Steel Drawer Slides with Rollers from the People's Republic of China,* 59 FR 60773 (November 28, 1994)).

Separate Rates

In the preliminary determination in this case, we found that each of the three respondents qualified for separate rates. The facts, as analyzed in the preliminary determination, were verified as accurate. No comments were received objecting to those findings, nor has any information come to our attention to alter our conclusion. Therefore, we are assigning the three respondents separate rates for the final determination. For discussion of our separate rates analysis in this case see the *Preliminary Determination.*

Nonmarket Economy Country Status

The Department has treated the PRC as a nonmarket economy country (NME) in all past antidumping investigations. Given that no information has been provided in this proceeding that would lead us to conclude otherwise, in accordance with section 771(18)(c) of the Act, we continue to treat the PRC as an NME for purposes of this investigation.

Surrogate Country

In the preliminary determination in this case, we determined that India is the preferred surrogate country for purposes of calculating the factors of production. *See* Section 773 (c)(4) of the Act. No comments were received objecting to our determination, nor has any information come to our attention to alter our conclusion. Therefore, we are using India as the preferred surrogate country for the final determination. Although India is the preferred surrogate country, we have resorted to Indonesia for a certain surrogate value where an Indian value was determined to be inappropriate. *See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the PRC,* 58 FR 48833, 48835 (September 20, 1993) (''*Helical Spring Lock Washers*'') and *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China,* 59 FR 55625, 55629 (November 8, 1994) (''*Certain Cased Pencils*'').

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of drawer slides from the PRC to the United States by Taiming, SHEEM, and GDMC were made at less-than-fair-value prices, 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

United States price was calculated on the basis of purchase price, as described in the preliminary determination, in accordance with section 772 (b) of the Act. Pursuant to findings at verification, minor adjustments were made to foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, the date of shipment, and the date of sale for certain sales reported by Taiming. For SHEEM, minor adjustments were made to the date of shipment and the date of payment for certain sales. In addition, we revised our calculation of foreign inland freight by valuing this charge in the surrogate country for all sales in the POI (*see* Comment 6 below). In the case of GDMC, minor adjustments were made to the reported date of shipment for certain sales.

Foreign Market Value

In accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, we calculated FMV based on factors of production cited in the preliminary determination, making adjustments based on our findings at verification. To calculate FMV, the verified factor amounts were multiplied by the appropriate surrogate values for the different inputs. We have used the same surrogate values used in the preliminary determination with certain revisions as discussed below (*see,* also, concurrence memorandum of October 18, 1995).

In our preliminary determination, we valued factory overhead, including energy, based on industry group income statements for ''Processing and Manufacture—Metals, Chemicals, and Products thereof'' from the September 1994 Reserve Bank of India Bulletin (1994 *RBI*). For the final determination, although we based the factory overhead calculations principally on the 1994 *RBI*, we did not use in our calculations the 1994 *RBI* figure for ''Power and fuel.'' Instead, we used the actual verified energy consumption figures provided by the respondents, which are specific to the drawer slides industry and more appropriate than energy consumption figures for a more general industry group (*see* Comment 5 below). To value electricity, we used the average Indian state electricity rates, as published in the June 1994, edition of *Current Energy Scene in India* by the Centre for Monitoring the Indian Economy, Pvt. Ltd. This information was used because, out of all the available sources, it is the most contemporaneous to the POI.

To value steel rivets, we used in our preliminary determination public information from the August 1994 *Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India, Imports* (*Indian Import Statistics*). Since the preliminary determination, the respondents have provided information which led us to question the reliability of the value for steel rivets provided in the *Indian Import Statistics.* Based on a comparison of the Indian import value used in the preliminary determination to other values on the record, we determined that the Indian import value for steel rivets does not provide a reliable basis for valuing the factor. Therefore, we have valued this input using Indonesian import statistics (*see* Comment 2 below).

For Taiming, SHEEM, and GDMC, we adjusted the factor value for cold-rolled steel to exclude the cost of ocean freight. In our preliminary determination, we added ocean freight to the surrogate value for cold-rolled steel. For the final determination, we determined that it was inappropriate to add ocean freight to the cost of cold-rolled steel when we are using a surrogate country domestic price to value the steel (*see* Comment 3 below).

In addition, for Taiming, SHEEM, and GDMC, we adjusted labor hours and consumption figures of certain factors to reflect verified information. We also used the verified distances between factory and input supplier to calculate foreign inland freight. In the case of GDMC, we used the POI consumption of plastic packing strip instead of plastic bags because it was discovered at verification that the company had misreported plastic packing strip as plastic bags.

Verification

As provided in section 776(b) of the Act, we verified the information submitted by the respondents for use in our final determination. We used standard verification procedures, including examination of relevant accounting and production records and original source documents provided by the respondents.

Interested Party Comments

Comment 1: Surrogate Value for Cold-Rolled Steel

The petitioner argues that in our final margin calculations, the Department should value the cold-rolled steel based on public information provided by the petitioner in its July 6, 1995, submission. The petitioner provided copies of excerpts from the *Iron and Steel Newsletter*, June–October 1994, published in India by Galkrishna Binani, on behalf of the Asian Industry & Information Services P. Limited. The cold-rolled steel prices as contained in the newsletter reflect wholesale prices for cold-rolled sheet in Bombay for the period June through October, 1994. The petitioner asserts that this data is more accurate than the data used in the preliminary determination because it is (1) contemporaneous with the POI, and (2) is more reflective of the price that a manufacturer of drawer slides would pay for steel.

The respondents contend that we should reject the petitioner's data on steel for the following reasons: (1) The data pertains to the price of cold-rolled sheet, not cold-rolled coil which was used by all three respondents in producing drawer slides; and (2) the price data does not specify the thickness of the steel. The respondents assert that the Department should continue to use the data used in the preliminary determination.

DOC Position. We agree with the respondents. In our preliminary determination, we used public information from the 1994 edition of *Statistics for Iron & Steel Industry in India,* published by the Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL). We continue to use this source in our final determination instead of the data provided by the petitioner because it provides prices for steel that most closely resembles the specifications of the product used by the respondents. Although the surrogate data provided by the petitioner is more contemporaneous to the POI than the SAIL data, we adjusted the SAIL data for inflation in an effort to accurately reflect the price of cold-rolled steel during the POI. We note that there is no factual information on record to support the petitioner's argument that the prices provided in the *Iron and Steel Newsletter* are more reflective of the price that a manufacturer of drawer slides would pay for steel.

Comment 2: Surrogate Value for Steel Rivets

The respondents contend that the surrogate value for rivets used in the preliminary determination is aberrational because (1) it results in calculations in which the cost of rivets is almost as high as the cost of steel used to produce the subject merchandise; and (2) it unreasonably exceeds all other known values for rivets, including price quotes obtained from Indian rivet manufacturers; actual prices paid for rivets by one of the respondents and the petitioner; Indian export data; and Indonesian import data. The aberrational value, the respondents claim, probably results from the small volume of rivets imported into India.

The petitioner argues that we should continue to value rivets based on Indian import data used in the preliminary determination. As support for not finding the value aberrational, the petitioner cites to the *Pure Magnesium from Ukraine,* where the Department determined that the primary surrogate value was not aberrational. The petitioner asserts that the Indian import data fulfills all of the Department's requirements for using publicly available, published information (PAPI) in NME investigations.

Moreover, the petitioner claims that the production of drawer slides requires a specific type of high-end rivet, known as a wheel rivet, which is far more expensive than standard rivets. This information was submitted in petitioner's case brief along with a diagram of a wheel rivet and a standard ''round-headed'' rivet. The petitioner asserts that prices the respondents have submitted in their July 10, 1995, submission are not applicable to wheel rivets and therefore should not be used as surrogate value for rivets. Specifically, the Indian domestic price quotes as obtained by the respondents are for ''round-head'' rivets, as referenced on the invoice. Additionally, the Indian domestic industry data reports values for ''tubular'' rivets. Therefore, the petitioner claims that the price data provided by the respondents are not relevant for purposes of valuing rivets for drawer slides. Furthermore, the petitioner argues that the petitioner's own rivet costs are not relevant to the costs of rivets that would be incurred by Indian producers of drawer slides or the respondents because of the different production process of rivets in the U.S.

DOC Position. We agree with the respondents that the Indian import value for rivets used in the preliminary determination is inappropriate and, therefore, is not a reliable factor to use as the surrogate value for rivets.

For purposes of establishing the reliability of the Indian import value used in the preliminary determination, we determined that it would be inappropriate to compare the Indian import value to the price quotes from Indian manufacturers of rivets as well as the Indian domestic industry data, as submitted by the respondents on July 10, 1995, because both data specifically pertain to prices for ''round-headed'' or ''tubular'' rivets. From the petitioner's submission regarding the type of rivets used in the production of drawer slides and our observations at verification, we have determined that the respondents utilized wheel rivets in producing drawer slides sold to the U.S. during the POI. Additionally, with respect to actual acquisition price of rivets obtained by Taiming, we note that there is no information on the record indicating whether the Hong Kong supplier actually manufactured the rivets. Absent evidence that the rivets Taiming purchased were actually sourced in a market economy, it would be inappropriate to use the actual purchase price to value the rivets. (*See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Ferrovanadium and Nitrided Vanadium from the Russian Federation* 60 FR 27957, 27962 (May 26, 1995) (''*Ferrovanadium from Russia*'') (In NME proceedings, our practice has been to determine whether a good or service obtained through a market economy transaction is, in fact, sourced from a market economy rather than merely purchased in it)).

Accordingly, to determine whether the Indian import value for rivets is reliable, we compared the Indian import value to the remaining values for rivets on the record (*i.e.*, Indian export price data; Indonesian import price data; and the petitioner's own cost for rivets as provided in the supplement to the petition submitted on November 15, 1994). We disagree with the petitioner's claim that the U.S. price is not relevant in determining the reliability of the Indian import data (*see Certain Cased Pencils,* 59 FR at 55633). As stated in *Certain Cased Pencils,* ''where, as here, questions have been raised about PAPI with respect to particular material inputs in the chosen surrogate country, it is the Department's responsibility to examine that PAPI.'' *Id.* A comparison of the Indian import value and the remaining values on the record indicates that the Indian import value is at least several times higher than the remaining values. Based on this comparison, we find that the Indian import value for rivets is not reliable. (*See,* also, concurrence memorandum of October 18, 1995.)

The petitioner's reliance on *Pure Magnesium from Ukraine* in support of its position is misplaced. In *Pure*

Magnesium from Ukraine, unlike this investigation, the evidence on the record did not support a finding that the primary surrogate value for an input was questionable. In this investigation, however, the prices used for comparisons from the sources discussed above, including the petitioner's own price for wheel rivets, demonstrate that the Indian import value is not reliable.

In our final calculations, we used the import statistics from our second surrogate country, Indonesia, to value rivets. Although Indonesia is not the first choice surrogate country in this investigation, in past cases, the Department has used values from other possible surrogate countries for inputs where the value from the first choice surrogate country was determined to be unreliable. (*See Certain Cased Pencils*, 59 FR at 55629 and *Helical Spring Lock Washers*, 58 FR at 48835.) In addition, the Indonesian import value is preferable over the other values we have on record (*i.e.*, Indian export statistics and the petitioner's own cost) because it is the Department's practice in selecting surrogate values (1) To use public information over privately obtained prices, wherever possible (*see Helical Spring Lock Washers*, 58 FR at 48835); and (2) not to use the Indian export prices because India maintains non-specific export subsidies (*see*, Memorandum from David Mueller, Director, Office of Policy, to Gary Taverman, Acting Director, Office of Antidumping Investigations, dated January 25, 1995). The Indonesian import value does not pertain to a specific type of rivet. However, the Indonesian import value is in line with the petitioner's own cost of wheel rivets as provided in the petition.

Comment 3: Ocean Freight

The respondents argue that the Department should not add ocean freight to the costs of cold-rolled steel. In the preliminary determination, the Department rejected the actual acquisition prices for cold-rolled steel coil used by the respondents in the production of subject merchandise, which included expenses for transporting the steel to the PRC. The Department instead used publicly available, published data based on domestic Indian prices for steel coil and added a surrogate ocean freight value to that amount. The respondents contend that the Department made an error in adding ocean freight to the domestic Indian surrogate price. They argue that the addition of ocean freight is inconsistent with the Department's past practice. In support of their position, the respondents cite to *Certain Cased Pencils* and *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Coumarin from the PRC*, 59 FR 66895 (December 28, 1993) (*Coumarin*).

The petitioner urges the Department to uphold its preliminary determination and add ocean freight to the cost of steel. The petitioner asserts that adding ocean freight costs to the surrogate Indian domestic steel price is consistent with the Department's practice.

DOC Position. We agree with the respondents that the ocean freight costs should not be added to the surrogate Indian domestic steel price. For the reasons discussed in the preliminary determination, we have rejected the respondents' actual experience in obtaining steel. Therefore, we must use a surrogate value methodology. As a surrogate value, we used a domestic Indian price for steel. Because we used a surrogate value that represents a domestically sourced input, it is inappropriate to include ocean freight.

Comment 4: Steel Scrap Offset

The petitioner argues that we should reject the scrap offsets reported by all three respondents on the grounds that the data concerning scrap offsets was untimely filed. The petitioner points out that all three respondents provided information regarding the scrap offset only seven days before verification, and even then, failed to provide any supporting documentation.

In addition, the petitioner claims that all three respondents failed to provide sufficient evidence at verification to justify the accuracy of the amount of scrap sales as submitted on July 10, 1995.

Each respondent claims that the amount of steel scrap offset for the POI was verified as reported in their submission of July 10, 1995. Therefore, they request that the Department make adjustments in the final calculations to adjust for steel scrap offsets.

DOC Position. We agree with the petitioner in part. We disagree with the petitioner that the respondents' submission on steel scrap offsets was untimely filed. The last day for submitting new information on the record in this investigation was July 10, 1995, seven days prior to the beginning of verification (*see* 19 CFR 353.31 (a)(i)). As the respondents submitted information on scrap offsets on July 10, 1995, the information was timely filed.

With respect to GDMC, we agree with the petitioner that the respondent has not provided information to support their claim that the reported amount of scrap sold specifically pertained to the sales of subject merchandise. SEW produced drawer slides for sales to the U.S. and domestic market during the POI. At verification, no methodology for allocating the total amount of steel scrap between the U.S. and domestic markets was provided. Therefore, we have no way of allocating the amount of scrap between the two markets. Accordingly, we did not allow any adjustments for steel scrap in our final calculation (*see*, also, concurrence memorandum of October 18, 1995).

With respect to Taiming, we also agree with the petitioner. Taiming reported that it used 1.15 mm steel to produce drawer slides sold to the United States during the POI. However, the copies of payment vouchers provided at verification to support the amount of reported steel scrap sold did not identify 1.15 mm steel. Therefore, we conclude that there is not sufficient evidence to support a finding that the reported amount of scrap sold pertained to the production of drawer slides sold to the U.S. Accordingly, we did not allow any adjustments for steel scrap in the final calculation (*see*, also, concurrence memorandum of October 18, 1995).

In the case of SHEEM, we agree with the petitioner that the respondent has failed to provide support for the reported amount of scrap sold during the POI. SHEEM reported the total amount of scrap generated, rather than the amount of steel scrap sold during the POI. At verification, company officials provided two invoices indicating sales of steel scrap sold during the POI. However, SHEEM was not able to support its claim that these two invoices represented the total amount of scrap sold during the POI. Accordingly, we did not allow any adjustments for steel scrap in our final calculation (*see* concurrence memorandum of October 18, 1995).

Comment 5: Energy

The respondents argue that the calculation of factory overhead should exclude the energy components from the 1994 *RBI* data. Instead, the respondents urge the Department to use the figures for energy based on the respondents' actual usage.

The respondents claim that the use of energy components as provided in 1994 *RBI* is inaccurate. They assert that in light of the fact that the Department has concluded that the drawer slides industry is not energy intensive, it should not rely on the factory overhead figure in the 1994 *RBI* because 42 percent of that figure consists of energy element.

In the preliminary determination, energy was treated as a component of factory overhead. The Department's

calculation of factory overhead was based on statistics provided in the 1994 *RBI* data. Inasmuch as the Department determined that the drawer slides industry is not an energy-intensive industry, the Department included a value for energy in its calculation of the percentage of factory overhead.

The petitioner contends that the respondents failed to provide any support for their conclusion that the energy factor could not reflect a non-energy intensive industry.

DOC Position. We agree with the respondents. The *RBI* statistics on which we relied at the preliminary determination pertain to a broad category of industries, some of which are considered to be energy-intensive (*e.g.*, automobiles, and other transport equipment). In our final determination, we used the actual verified energy consumption figures provided by the respondents, which are specific to the drawer slides industry and more appropriate than energy consumption figures for a more general industry group. To value electricity, we used the average Indian state electricity rates, as published in the June 1994, edition of *Current Energy Scene in India* by the Centre for Monitoring the Indian Economy, Pvt. Ltd. (*See*, also, concurrence memorandum of October 18, 1995.)

Comment 6: Foreign Inland Freight Expenses for SHEEM

The respondent requests the Department to revise its calculation of foreign inland freight. SHEEM contends that the Department incorrectly calculated foreign inland freight in the preliminary determination by computing a cost based on an amount of actual inland freight paid on a single shipment. SHEEM argues that instead of using the cost of a single shipment, the Department should use either SHEEM's actual freight expenses as reported to the Department or a surrogate country cost to value foreign inland freight.

DOC Position. We agree with the respondent. For all shipments made during the POI, SHEEM used one freight forwarding company to handle both the shipment from the factory to the Guangzhou port and the shipment from the Guangzhou port to Hong Kong. Because the transportation services were sourced from a company which is located in China and is a joint venture company between a Chinese company and a Hong Kong company, we conclude that the inland transportation charges SHEEM paid do not reflect a market economy based price (*see, Ferrovanadium from Russia*). Therefore, in our final determination, we applied a surrogate country cost to value foreign inland freight for all U.S. sales made during the POI.

Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(1) and 735(c)(4)(B) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to continue to suspend liquidation of all entries of drawer slides from the PRC that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after June 5, 1995, which is the date of publication of our notice of preliminary determination in the Federal Register. The imports of subject merchandise that are sold by Taiming, SHEEM, and GDMC and manufactured by producers whose factors formed the basis for the zero margin will be excluded from an antidumping duty order should one be issued. Under the Department's NME methodology, the zero rate for each exporter is based on a comparison of the exporter's U.S. price and FMV based on the factors of production of a specific producer (which may be a different party). The exclusion, therefore, applies only to subject merchandise sold by the exporter and manufactured by that specific producer. Merchandise that is sold by the exporter but manufactured by other producers will be subject to the order, if one is issued. The Customs Service shall require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated amount by which the FMV exceeds the USP as shown below. These suspension of liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice.

The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin percentage
Taiming/Taiming	0.00
Taiming/Any other manufacturer	55.69
SHEEM/SHEEM	0.00
SHEEM/Any other manufacturer	55.69
GDMC/Second Experimental Workshop	0.00
GDMC/Any other manufacturer	55.69
"PRC-Wide" Rate	55.69

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. As our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine whether these imports are causing material injury, or threat of material injury, to the U.S. industry within 45 days. If the ITC determines that material injury, or threat of material injury does not exist, the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted will be refunded or cancelled. If the ITC determines that such injury does exist, the Department will issue an antidumping duty order directing Customs officials to assess antidumping duties on all imports of the subject merchandise entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the effective date of the suspension of liquidation.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.20(a)(4).

Dated: October 18, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–26328 Filed 10–23–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Modernization Transition Committee (MTC)

ACTION: Notice of Public Meeting.

TIME AND DATE: October 30, 1995 from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

PLACE: This meeting will take place at the DoubleTree Hotel, 1750 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD, 20852.

STATUS: The meeting will be open to the public. There will be a public comment period from 2:30–3:30 p.m. Seating is available for approximately 50 people.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: This meeting will cover: the Secretary of Commerce's Team Report on Adequacy of NEXRAD Coverage and Degradation of Weather Services under the National Weather Service Modernization for 32 Areas of Concern.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Ms. Julie Scanlon, National Weather Service, Modernization Staff, 1325 East-West Highway, SSMC2 #9332, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910. Telephone: (301) 713–1413.

Dated: October 19, 1995.

Nicholas R. Scheller,

Manager, National Implementation Staff.

[FR Doc. 95–26349 Filed 10–23–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–12–M