

[Docket 44-95]

Foreign-Trade Zone 21, Charleston, South Carolina; Application for Expansion

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the South Carolina State Ports Authority (SCSPA), grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 21, Charleston, South Carolina, requesting authority to expand its zone to include a site in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, adjacent to the Georgetown Customs port of entry. The application was submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR Part 400). It was formally filed on August 15, 1995.

FTZ 21 was approved on June 12, 1975 (Board Order 106, 40 FR 25613, 6/17/75) and expanded on February 28, 1995 (Board Order 734, 60 FR 12735, 3/8/95). The zone project includes 6 general-purpose sites in the Charleston, South Carolina, Customs port of entry: *Site 1* (134 acres)—Tri-County Industrial Park, Summerville; *Site 2* (57 acres)—Cainhoy Industrial Park, Wando; *Site 3* (160 acres)—Crowfield Corporate Center, Goose Creek; *Site 4* (998 acres)—Low Country Regional Industrial Park, Early Branch; *Site 5* (2,017 acres)—SCSPA's terminal complex, Charleston; *Site 6* (19 acres)—Meadow Street Business Park, Loris; and, *Temporary Site* (23 acres; expires December 31, 1997)—Wando Park, Mount Pleasant.

The applicant is now requesting authority to further expand the general-purpose zone to include an additional site (proposed *Site 7*—1,782 acres) at the Myrtle Beach International Airport, including a portion of the former Myrtle Beach U.S. Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach (Horry County), South Carolina. The former Air Force Base site is in the process of being transferred to the Myrtle Beach Air Base Redevelopment Authority.

No specific manufacturing requests are being made at this time. Such requests would be made to the Board on a case-by-case basis.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment on the application 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 October 23, 1995. Rebuttal comments in response to material

submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to November 6, 1995).

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, 81 Mary Street, Charleston, South Carolina 29402;
and
Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 3716, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: August 17, 1995

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary

[FR Doc. 95-20931 Filed 8-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

International Trade Administration

[A-588-815]

Gray Portland Cement and Clinker 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 February 11, 1994, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of review of the antidumping duty order on gray portland cement and clinker from Japan. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter, Onoda Cement Co., Ltd., and the period May 1, 1992, through April 30, 1993.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, and the correction of clerical errors, we have changed the final results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 23, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Genovese or Michael Heaney, Office of Antidumping Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC. 20230; telephone (202) 482-5254.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

On May 3, 1993, the Ad Hoc Committee of Southern California

Producers of Gray Portland Cement (the petitioner) requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on gray portland cement and clinker from Japan (56 FR 21658, May 10, 1991) for Onoda Cement Co., Ltd. (Onoda). We initiated the review, covering the period May 1, 1992, through April 30, 1993, on June 25, 1993 (58 FR 34414). On February 11, 1994, we published the preliminary results of the administrative review (59 FR 6614). The Department has now completed the administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review are gray portland cement and clinker from Japan. Gray portland cement is a hydraulic cement and the primary component of concrete. Clinker, an intermediate material produced when manufacturing cement, has no use other than grinding into finished cement. Microfine cement was specifically excluded from the antidumping duty order.

Gray portland cement is currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item number 2523.29, and clinker is currently classifiable under HTS item number 2523.10. Gray portland cement has also been entered under item number 2523.90 as "other hydraulic cements".

The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written product description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received comments from the petitioner and from the respondent. At the request of the petitioner and respondent, we held a public hearing on March 29, 1994.

Comment 1

Petitioner argues that the Department inaccurately adjusted FMV for home market indirect selling expenses in those instances where the Department compared U.S. sales of cement imported into the United States and further manufactured into concrete with sales of cement in the home market. Where such comparisons occurred, petitioner states that, because the imported merchandise was cement, the Department appropriately deducted further manufacturing costs and attempted to make cement-to-cement comparisons. However, petitioner