

project will not ensure the processor will receive any State processing contracts.

Dated: January 18, 1996.

Ellen Haas,

*Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services.*

[FR Doc. 96-2178 Filed 2-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-30-U

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 788]

#### Grant of Authority; Establishment of a Foreign-Trade Zone; Anniston, AL

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

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

Whereas, the Anniston Metropolitan Airport Board of Commissioners (formerly the Anniston-Calhoun County Airport Commission), on behalf of the City of Anniston, Alabama (the Grantee), has made application to the Board (FTZ Docket 32-94, 59 FR 54432, 10/31/94), requesting the establishment of a foreign-trade zone in Anniston, Alabama, adjacent to the Birmingham Customs port of entry; and,

Whereas, notice inviting public comment has been given in the Federal Register and the Board has found that the requirements of the Act and the Board's regulations are satisfied, and that approval of the application is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby grants to the Grantee the privilege of establishing a foreign-trade zone, designated on the records of the Board as Foreign-Trade Zone No. 211, at the site described in the application, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 22nd day of January 1996.

Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Ronald H. Brown,

*Secretary of Commerce, Chairman and Executive Officer.*

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

*Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96-3069 Filed 2-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-25-P

### International Trade Administration

[A-580-812]

#### Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit or Above From the Republic of Korea; Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Time Limits

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limits.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limits of the preliminary and final results of the second antidumping duty administrative review of dynamic random access memory semiconducts (DRAMS) from the Republic of Korea. The review covers two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period May 1, 1994 through April 30, 1995.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 12, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy F. Unger, Jr. or 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) 482-0651 or (202) 482-3814, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994, the Department is extending the time limits for completion of the preliminary results until June 29, 1996. We will issue our final results for this review by December 27, 1996.

These extensions are in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(3)(A)).

Dated: February 2, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 96-3064 Filed 2-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-580-807]

#### Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From the Republic of Korea; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of amended final results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On August 17, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip from the Republic of Korea (60 FR 42835). Clerical errors which were timely filed by the parties were not corrected by the Department prior to the time the parties filed suit with the Court of International Trade (CIT). Therefore, leave was requested to correct the clerical errors in this case. Pursuant to orders issued by the CIT on November 16, 1995, and November 27, 1995, granting leave to the Department to correct ministerial errors, we have corrected several ministerial errors with respect to sales of subject merchandise by four Korean manufacturers/exporters. The errors were present in our final results of review. The review covers the period November 30, 1990, through May 31, 1992. We are publishing this amendment to the final results of review in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 353.28(c) and the orders issued by the CIT.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 12, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy F. Unger, Jr. or Thomas F. Futtner, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482-0651/3814.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The review covers four manufacturers/exporters of polyethylene terephthalate (PET) film from the Republic of Korea (Korea): Cheil Synthetics, Inc. (Cheil), SKC Limited (SKC), Kolon Industries, Inc. (Kolon), and STC Corporation (STC), and the period November 30, 1990 through May 31, 1992. The Department published the preliminary results of review on July 8, 1994 (59 FR 35098), and the final results of review on August 17, 1995 (60 FR 42835).

Clerical errors which were timely filed by the parties were not corrected by the Department prior to the time the parties filed suit with the CIT. Therefore, leave was requested to correct the clerical errors in this case. On November 16, 1995, and November 27, 1995, the CIT issued orders granting leave to the Department to correct ministerial errors in these final results.

#### Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

#### Scope of Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip, whether extruded or coextruded. The films excluded from this review are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches (0.254 micrometers) thick. Roller transport cleaning film which has at least one of its surfaces modified by the application of 0.5 micrometers of SBR latex has also been ruled as not within the scope of the order.

PET film is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheading 3920.62.00.00. The HTS subheading is provided for convenience and for U.S. Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage.

For most of the respondents the period of review (POR) covers November 30, 1990 through May 31, 1992. Because Cheil was determined to have a *de minimis* margin in the *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value* (56 FR 16305) (LTFV), Cheil's POR begins on April 22, 1991, when suspension of its merchandise was first ordered, and runs through May 31, 1992.

#### Ministerial Errors in Final Results of Review

The CIT granted leave to the Department to correct ministerial errors. The Department determined that it made the following clerical errors in the final results:

#### All Respondents

In the final calculations, the Department's cost of production (COP) test for all respondents inadvertently retained products sold below the COP in

less than three months. We corrected the COP test calculations for all respondents by revising the COP test to exclude those products from our dumping analysis which were sold in less than three months during the period of review (POR) and were also sold below COP for those months (i.e., a product sold in two months would be excluded from analysis if that product was sold below COP for two months).

#### Cheil

In our final calculations we inadvertently failed to add Cheil's duty drawback for local export sales (a type of home market sale) to Cheil's net home market price before conducting the COP test. We corrected this clerical error by adding duty drawback to Cheil's net home market price before conducting the COP test.

In our final calculations we inadvertently included packing and imputed credit expenses twice in the calculation of constructed value (CV). We corrected this by re-writing the CV program to include these expenses only once.

Our final calculations contained a typographical error in the product code variable in the difference-in-merchandise section. We corrected this error by re-writing this section of the calculations with the correct product code variable.

#### SKC

The final calculations contained a typographical error in the variable name for two models of PET film in SKC's model-matching section. We corrected this error by inserting the correct variable name for these two models of PET film.

In our final calculations, we inadvertently re-calculated SKC's imputed U.S. credit expense using date of sale for unpaid sales to Anacomp instead of the date of payment. We corrected this error by re-calculating SKC's U.S. credit expense using the date of payment.

Our final results calculations failed to use the proper data set containing SKC's further-processed sales in the United States in calculating SKC's exporter's sales price (ESP) transactions. We corrected this error by using the proper data set for SKC's ESP calculations. In our final calculations we incorrectly computed profit attributable to further-processed sales by inadvertently deducting SKC's U.S. movement expenses twice from this calculation. We corrected this error by re-writing the further-processed sales program to deduct these expenses only once.

#### Kolon

In the final calculations for Kolon we re-calculated Kolon's U.S. inland insurance expense based upon revised data gathered at verification. These calculations contained a typographical error. We corrected the typographical error in the final calculations of Kolon's U.S. inland insurance expense.

#### STC

For our final calculations we inadvertently re-calculated STC's home market credit expense based upon a shorter payment period than its actual payment period. We corrected our final calculations by computing STC's home market credit expense based upon the actual payment period.

#### Amended Final Results of Review

Upon correction of the ministerial errors listed above, the Department has determined that the following margins exist for the periods indicated:

Manufacturer/exporter	Percent margin
November 30, 1990 through May 31, 1992:	
SKC Limited .....	0.11
Kolon Industries .....	0.60
STC Corporation .....	11.41
April 22, 1991 through May 31, 1992:	
Cheil Synthetics .....	0.07

The Customs Service shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and FMV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions concerning each respondent directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these amended final results of administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed firms will be the rates outlined above, except for Cheil and SKC, which, because their weighted-average margins were *de minimis*, will be zero percent; (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 in the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most

recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department in the LTFV investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 4.82%, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation.

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

This notice serves as the 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 occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of the APO is a sanctionable violation.

This amendment of final results of review and notice are in accordance with section 751(f) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(f)) and 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Dated: January 31, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,  
Assistant Secretary for Import  
Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-3065 Filed 2-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-538-802]

### Shop Towels From Bangladesh; 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 21, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) issued the preliminary results of its 1993-1994 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on shop towels from Bangladesh (60 FR 48970; September 21, 1995). The review

covers six manufacturers/exporters. The review period is March 1, 1993, through February 28, 1994. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. No comments were received. Therefore, the final results are the same as the preliminary results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 12, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Matthew Rosenbaum or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On September 21, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of its 1993-1994 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on shop towels from Bangladesh (60 FR 48970).

##### Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

##### Scope of Review

The product covered by this administrative review is shop towels. Shop towels are absorbent industrial wiping cloths made from a loosely woven fabric. The fabric may be either 100 percent cotton or a blend of materials. Shop towels are currently classifiable under item numbers 6307.10.2005 and 6307.10.2015 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedules* (HTS). Although HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding remains dispositive.

##### Final Results of Review

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received no comments. Therefore, we determine that the following percentage weighted-average margins exist for the period March 1, 1993, through February 28, 1994:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (per-cent)
Eagle Star Mills Ltd .....	42.31
Greyfab (Bangladesh) Ltd .....	0.00
Hashem International .....	0.00
Khaled Textile Mills Ltd .....	9.61

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (per-cent)
Shabnam Textiles .....	1.74
Sonar Cotton Mills (Bangladesh) Ltd .....	42.31

<sup>1</sup> No shipments or sales subject to this review; rate is from LTFV investigation.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and foreign market value may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions on each exporter directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be those rates established above (except that if the rate for a firm is *de minimis*, i.e., less than 0.5 percent, a cash deposit of zero will be required for that firm); (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 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 or the original investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 4.60 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the LTFV investigation (57 FR 3996).

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

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 occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative