the period of review and which were not found to have separate rates, Tehnoforestexport, Alexandria, Brasov, Barlad, Ploiesti, Slatina, and Suceava, and for all other Romanian exporters, the cash deposit rate will be 00.00%, the Romania-wide rate established in the most recent segment of the proceeding; and (3) for non-Romanian exporters of subject merchandise from Romania, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the Romanian supplier of that exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 of the Department's regulations to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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

Dated: March 29, 1996.
Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.
[FR Doc. 96–8508 Filed 4–5–96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A-834-802, A-835-802, A-844-802]

Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium From Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan

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

ACTION: Notice of price determination on uranium from Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section IV.C.1. of the antidumping suspension agreement on uranium from Kazakstan, the Department of Commerce (the Department) calculated a price for uranium of \$12.25/lb. On the basis of this price, the export quota for uranium pursuant to Section IV.A. of the Kazakstani agreement, as amended on March 27, 1995, is 500,000 lbs. for the period April 1, 1996, through September 30, 1996. Exports pursuant to other

provisions of the Kazakstani agreement are not affected by this price. The export quota for uranium pursuant to Section IV.A. of the Uzbek agreement, as amended on October 13, 1995, was determined by the last price determination (60 FR 52368), so this notice does not affect them. The Kyrgyz have no Appendix A quota, so this notice does not affect them.

notice does not affect them.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 1, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Alexander Braier or Yury Beyzarov,

Office of Agreements Compliance,

Import Administration, International

Trade Administration, U.S. Department
of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution

Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20230;
telephone: (202) 482–1324 or (202) 482–2243, respectively.

Price Calculation

Background

Section IV.C.1. of the antidumping suspension agreement on uranium from Kazakstan specifies that the Department will issue its observed market price on April 1, 1996, and use it to determine the quota applicable to exports from Kazakstan during the period April 1, 1996, to September 30, 1996. Consistent with the Department's letter of interpretation dated February 22, 1993, we provided interested parties with our preliminary price determination on March 15, 1996.

Calculation Summary

Section IV.C.1. of the Kazakstani agreement specifies how the components of the market price are reached. In order to determine the spot market price, the Department utilized the monthly average of the Uranium Price Information System Spot Price Indicator (UPIS SPI) and the weekly average of the Uranium Exchange Spot Price (Ux Spot). In order to determine the long-term market price, the Department utilized the weightedaverage long-term price as determined by the Department on the basis of information provided by market participants and a simple average of the UPIS U.S. Base Price for the months in which there were new contracts reported. Our letters to market participants provided a contract summary sheet and directions requesting the submitter to report his/ her best estimate of the future price of merchandise to be delivered in accordance with the contract delivery schedules (in U.S. dollars per pound U₃O₈ equivalent). Using the information reported in the proprietary summary sheets, the Department calculated the present value of the prices reported for

any future deliveries assuming an annual inflation rate of 2.52 percent, which was derived from a rolling average of the annual GDP Implicit Price Deflator index from the past four years. The Department used the base quantities reported on the summary sheet for the purpose of weight-averaging the prices of the long-term contracts submitted by market participants. We then calculated a simple average of the UPIS U.S. Base Price and the long-term price determined by the Department.

Weighting

The Department used the average spot and long-term volumes of U.S. utility and domestic supplier purchases, as reported by the Energy Information Administration (EIA), to weight the spot and long-term components of the observed price. In this instance, we have used purchase data from the period 1991–1994. During this period, the spot market accounted for 73.10 percent of total purchases, and the long-term market for 26.90 percent.

As in previous determinations, the Department used the Energy Information Administration's (EIA) Uranium Industry Annual to determine the available average spot- and longterm volumes of U.S. utility purchases. We have updated the data to reflect the period 1991 through 1994. The EIA has withheld certain contracting data from the public versions of the *Uranium* Industry Annual 1993 and the Uranium Industry Annual 1994 because this data was business proprietary. The Department has used this data to update its weighting calculation. Accordingly, it may only be released under Administrative Protective Order.

Calculation Announcement

The Department determined, using the methodology and information described above, that the observed market price is \$12.25. This reflects an average spot market price of \$12.46, weighted at 73.10 percent, and an average long-term contract price of \$11.67, weighted at 26.90 percent. Since this price is above the \$12.00/lb. minimum expressed in Appendix A of the amended Kazakstani agreement, Kazakstan receives a quota of 500,000 lbs. for the period April 1, 1996, to September 30, 1996.

Comment

Consistent with the Department's letter of interpretation dated February 22, 1993, we provided interested parties our preliminary price determination on March 15, 1996. We received a comment from interested parties stating that the

Department should use the UPIS "U.S. Base Price Indicator" as one of the indicating variables for the long term price as opposed to the UPIS "Base Price Indicator," because the former represents U.S. utility purchases, while the latter represents purchases worldwide. As a result of the comment, we have used the UPIS "U.S. Base Price Indicator" in our calculation.

After analysis of the above comment, we have determined that the observed market price for uranium is \$12.25/lb. The Department invites parties to provide pricing information for use in the next price determination. Any such information should be provided for the record and should be submitted to the Department by September 5, 1996.

Dated: April 1, 1996.
Joseph A. Spetrini,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.
[FR Doc. 96–8509 Filed 4–5–96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Indiana University, Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 95–117. Applicant: Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47402. Instrument: Noninvasive Blood Pressure Measurement Monitor. Manufacturer: TNO Biomedical Instrumentation, The Netherlands. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 4768, February 8, 1996.

Comments: None received. Decision: Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides: (1) noninvasive monitoring preventing sleep disruption, (2) hydrostatic height correction, and (3) discrimination of increased cardiac output versus increased peripheral resistance. The National Institutes of Health advises in its memorandum dated January 31, 1996 that (1) these capabilities are pertinent to the applicant's intended purpose and (2) it knows of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument for the applicant's intended use.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

Frank W. Creel

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff
[FR Doc. 96–8514 Filed 4–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–F

University of California, Davis; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This is a decision pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 AM and 5:00 PM in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

DECISION: Denied. Applicant has failed to establish that domestic instruments of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument for the intended purposes are not available.

REASONS: Section 301.5(e)(4) of the regulations requires the denial of applications that have been denied without prejudice to resubmission if they are not resubmitted within the specified time period. This is the case for the following docket.

Docket Number: 95–078. Applicant: University of California, Davis, Exercise Science Department, 264 Hickey Gym, Davis, CA 95616. Instrument: Nitrogen Analyzer, Model N2-TEST.

Manufacturer: Erich Jaeger, Germany.
Date of Denial without Prejudice to Resubmission: December 4, 1995.
Frank W. Creel

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff [FR Doc. 96–8515 Filed 4–5–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS-F

Tulane University Hospital and Clinic, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Electron Microscopes

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 95–116. Applicant: Tulane University Hospital and Clinic, New Orleans, LA 70112. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model H7100. Manufacturer: Hitachi Scientific Instruments, Japan. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 4767, February 8, 1996. Order Date: December 17, 1993.

Docket Number: 95–118. Applicant: The Colorado College, Colorado Springs, CO 80903. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model CM 100. Manufacturer: Philips, The Netherlands. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 4768, February 8, 1996. Order Date: May 4, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–119. Applicant: California State University, Los Angeles, CA 90032. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model JEM-1200EX II. Manufacturer: JEOL Ltd., Japan. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 4768, February 8, 1996. Order Date: February 28, 1994.

Comments: None received. Decision: Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as these instruments are intended to be used, was being manufactured in the United States at the time the instruments were ordered. Reasons: Each foreign instrument is a conventional transmission electron microscope (CTEM) and is intended for research or scientific educational uses requiring a CTEM. We know of no CTEM, or any other instrument suited to these purposes, which was being manufactured in the United States either at the time of order of each instrument or at the time of receipt of application by the U.S. Customs Service.

Frank W. Creel

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff [FR Doc. 96–8523 Filed 4–5–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS-F

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 032996A]

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council will convene public meetings.

DATES: See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for specific dates and times.

ADDRESSES: The Mackerel AP and all SSC meetings will be held at the Pontchartrain Hotel, 2031 St. Charles