

statute does not explicitly instruct us to disregard below-cost sales in the calculation of profit. Accordingly, it would be inappropriate for the Department to read such a requirement into the statute. Thus, the Department does not deem it necessary to change its methodology as further suggested by petitioner. (Comment 1 also relates to this issue.)

Comment 9: Torrington argues that a sale should be presumed to be an export sale whenever the circumstances suggest that the sales are not for home market consumption. As an example, Torrington comments that, where the record for a company shows that either a HM customer (or related party) has U.S. manufacturing facilities which use bearings in a further-manufactured article or export documents were prepared by the manufacturer, the Department should presume that the manufacturer knew or should have known that the sales in question were for export. Petitioner further notes that, in this case, if the respondent provides adequate rebuttal evidence, the presumption is then defeated. Petitioner argues that this creates incentive for respondents to find out whether such sales are for home market consumption and to report relevant information.

Department's Position: With the exception of Route B sales, we find no evidence on the record that HM sales of NMB/Pelmech's merchandise were exported. With respect to Route B sales, see our response to Comment 3.

Comment 10: Torrington argues that the Department should not exclude U.S. sales of bearings used by a related party as a minor component in a further-manufactured article.

Department's Position: Since NMB/Pelmech did not have sales of bearings used by a related party as a minor component in further manufacturing, and the Department did not exclude such sales in this case, this issue does not apply to the firm.

Comment 11: Torrington argues that the Department should calculate profit on the basis of sampled, above-cost HM sales only. Petitioner contends that profit for CV should be based on profits on sampled HM sales, not on sales of the class or kind of merchandise generally in the home market. Petitioner claims that the use of the sampled sales insures that profit is based on a verified database of sales of in-scope merchandise of the same general class or kind, as opposed to the use of general profit data, for which the Department has little assurance that the reported profits are actually based on sales of in-scope merchandise of the same general class or kind.

Department's Position: We disagree with Torrington's contention that profit should be calculated on the basis of the sampled sales. The Department consistently used profit information based on the general class or kind of merchandise. See *AFBs IV* at 10923. As far as above-cost sales are concerned, see our response to Comment 3.

Comment 12: Torrington asks that the Department reconsider its treatment of antidumping duties and deduct such duties from ESP as a selling cost.

Department's Position: We disagree with petitioner. As stated in *AFBs IV* at 10905, it has been our consistent interpretation of 19 CFR 353.26 that evidence of reimbursement is necessary before we can make an adjustment to USP. In this review, Torrington has not identified record evidence that there was reimbursement of antidumping duties, and we have not adjusted USP for the duties.

Final Results of Review

We determine that, for the period May 1, 1993, through April 30, 1994, NMB/Pelmech had a weighted-average antidumping duty margin of 0.19 percent, which is de minimis. We further determine that NMB/Pelmech has not sold ball bearings at less than FMV for three consecutive review periods, including this review period. The certification from the firm (mentioned above) and the fact that there were no comments with respect to our intent to revoke this order in the preliminary results warrant revocation of the order. Therefore, the Department is revoking the order on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof from Thailand, with regard to ball bearings, in accordance with section 751(c) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.25.

This revocation applies to all entries of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after May 1, 1994. The Department will order the suspension of liquidation ended for all such entries and will instruct the Customs Service to release any cash deposit or bonds. The Department will further instruct Customs to refund with interest any cash deposits on post-May 1, 1994 entries. In addition, the Department will terminate the review covering subject merchandise from Thailand sold during the period May 1, 1994, through April 30, 1995, which was initiated on June 19, 1995 (60 FR 31952).

Assessment Rates: The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Because

sampling and other simplification methods prevent entry-by-entry assessments, we will calculate wherever possible an exporter/importer specific assessment rate for each class or kind of antifriction bearings.

Exporter's Sales Price Sales: For ESP sales, which we sampled, we divided the total dumping margin for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of those reviewed sales for the importer. We will direct Customs to assess the resulting percentage margin against the entered Customs values for the subject merchandise on entries under the relevant order during the review period. While the Department is aware that the entered value of sales during the period of review (POR) is not necessarily equal to the entered value of entries during the POR, use of entered value of sales as the basis of the assessment rate permits the Department to collect a reasonable approximation of the antidumping duties which would have been determined if the Department had reviewed those sales of merchandise actually entered during the POR.

This notice 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 the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This administrative review, revocation, and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and sections 353.22 and 353.25 of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.22 and 19 CFR 353.25).

Dated: June 21, 1996.
Robert S. LaRussa,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.
[FR Doc. 96-16614 Filed 6-27-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

Minority Business Development Agency

Business Development Center Applications: Charleston, South Carolina

AGENCY: Minority Business Development Agency, Commerce.
ACTION: Amendment.

SUMMARY: On page 29737, Federal Register, dated Wednesday, June 12, 1996, solicitation to operate the Charleston Minority Business Development Center is amended to read: Pre-Application Conference: Wednesday, June 26, 1996, at 9:00 a.m., at the Atlanta Regional Office, 401 W. Peachtree Street, N.W., Suite 1715, Atlanta, Georgia 30308-3516. The closing date for applications is July 15, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION AND AN APPLICATION PACKAGE, CONTACT: Robert Henderson at (404) 730-3300.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance: 11.800 Minority Business Development Center)

Dated: June 24, 1996.

Frances B. Douglas,
Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer,
Minority Business Development Agency.
[FR Doc. 96-16545 Filed 6-27-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-21-P

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council; Open Meeting

AGENCY: Sanctuaries and Reserves Division (SRD), Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), National Ocean Service (NOS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council Notice of Open Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Council was established in December 1991 to advise and assist the Secretary of Commerce in the development and implementation of the comprehensive management plan for the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.

TIME AND PLACE: July 12, 1996 from 9:00 a.m. until adjournment. The meeting location will be at the Monroe County Government Center, Conference Room, 2696 Overseas Highway, Marathon, Florida.

AGENDA: .

1. Update on the status of the Final Environmental Impact Statement and Management Plan for the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.

2. Discussion of water quality issues in the Florida Keys.

3. Discussion of the Site Characterization of the Florida Keys compiled by Kathleen Sullivan and Dr. Mark Chiappone.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: The meeting will be open to public participation; the time period from 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., will be set aside for oral comments and questions. Seats will be set aside for the public and the media. Seats will be available on a first-come first-served basis.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: June Cradick at (305) 743-2437.

(Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog Number 11.429 Marine Sanctuary Program)

Dated: June 24, 1996.

W. Stanley Wilson,
Assistant Administrator for Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management.

[FR Doc. 96-16499 Filed 6-27-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-08-M

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

TIME AND DATE: 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 2, 1996.

LOCATION: Room 420, East West Towers, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, Maryland.

STATUS: Open to the Public.

Matter to be Considered

FY 1998 Budget

The staff will brief the Commission on issues related to the Commission's budget for fiscal year 1998.

For a recorded message containing the latest agenda information, call (301) 504-0709.

CONTACT PERSON FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Sadye E. Dunn, Office of the Secretary, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20207 (301) 504-0800.

Dated: June 25, 1996.

Sadye E. Dunn,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-16722 Filed 6-26-96; 1:59 pm]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the Relocation of the 1111th Signal Battalion, the 1108th Signal Brigade and a Portion of the Information Systems Engineering Command-CONUS From Fort Ritchie, Maryland, to Fort Detrick, Maryland

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice availability.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Public Law 101-510, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended the relocation of the 1111th Signal Battalion, the 1108th Signal Brigade and a portion of the Information Systems Engineering Command-CONUS from Fort Ritchie, Maryland, to Fort Detrick, Maryland. The Army will also relocate the Technical Applications Office and associated Base Operations support personnel to Fort Detrick, Maryland, pursuant to this recommendation.

The Environmental Assessment (EA) evaluates the environmental impacts associated with the transfer of approximately 1,147 personnel and the renovation and construction projects required to accommodate these transferring personnel. Of these positions, approximately 636 military will be attached to Fort Detrick for quarters, rations, and UCMJ purposes only. These 636 military and 158 civilian personnel will continue to work at the Alternate National Military Command Center, control of which will be transferred from the Military District of Washington to the Medical Command as a result of this action. The remaining personnel will be attached to Fort Detrick for all purposes.

No significant project environmental impacts were identified. Potential for only minor or insignificant impacts in anticipated in the areas of noise, water quality, stormwater, geology, soils, traffic, asbestos and radon management, visual and aesthetic values, on-post housing, and shops and services. Minor impacts from the construction of new facilities and the renovation of existing buildings are not expected to be significant with the implementation of Best Management Practices, other required procedures, surveys and studies. Potential asbestos or random impacts will be mitigated by conducting the proper testing and taking action as necessary. Traffic impacts are not expected to be significant, and any