intermediate, and a metal complexing agent. Glycine is currently classified under subheading 2922.49.4020 of the Harmonized Tariff schedule of the United States (''HTSUS''). The scope of this order includes glycine of all purity levels. In a separate scope ruling, the Department determined that D(-)PhenylglycineEthyl Dane Salt is outside the scope of the order.[2]

Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Determination

As a result of the determinations by the Department and the Commission that revocation of these antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act, the Department hereby orders the continuation of the antidumping duty orders on glycine from the PRC. The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to continue to collect antidumping and countervailing duty deposits at the rates in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise. The effective date of continuation of this order will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this Notice of Continuation. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) and 751(c)(6) of the Act, the Department intends to initiate the next five-year review of these orders not later than June 2005.

Dated: July 19, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–18808 Filed 7–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[2] See Notice of Scope Rulings, 62 FR 62288 (November 21, 1997). We note that scope ruling are made on an order-wide basis.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–501]

Natural Bristle Paint Brushes and Brush Heads From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of administrative review: natural bristle paint brushes and brush heads from the People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: On March 15, 2000, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on natural bristle paint brushes and brush heads from the People's Republic of China (PRC). This administrative review covers the period February 1, 1998 through January 31, 1999.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes to the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled ''Final Results of Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 25, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sarah Ellerman or Maureen Flannery, Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–4106 or (202) 482–3020, respectively.

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the provisions codified at 19 CFR part 351 (1998).

Background

On March 15, 2000, the Department published the preliminary results of review of the antidumping duty order on natural bristle paint brushes and brush heads from the PRC (65 FR 13944). We received surrogate value comments from respondent Hebei Founder Import & Export Company (Founder) and the Paint Applicator Division of the American Brush Manufacturers Association (petitioner) on April 3 and 4, 2000 respectively. On April 14, 2000 we received rebuttal comments regarding surrogate values from respondent Hunan Provincial Native Produce & Animal By-Products Import and Export Corp. (Hunan). On April 24, 2000, we received comments regarding our preliminary calculations on behalf of the petitioner and Founder. On May 2, 2000, we received rebuttal comments from petitioner and respondents Hunan and Founder. The Department has now completed this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of natural bristle paint brushes and brush heads from the PRC. Excluded from the review are paint brushes and brush heads with a blend of 40% natural bristles and 60% synthetic filaments. The merchandise under review is currently classifiable under item 9603.40.40.40 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the Department's written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the ''Issues and Decision Memorandum'' (Decision Memo) from Joseph A. Spetrini, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to Troy H. Cribb, Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated July 14, 2000, which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues which parties have raised and to which we have responded, all of which are in the Decision Memo, is attached to this notice as an appendix. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B–099 of the main Department building (B–099). In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at *http://ia.ita.doc.gov.* The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of comments received, we have made certain changes in the margin calculations for Hunan and Founder. Any alleged programming or clerical errors are discussed in the relevant sections of the Decision Memo, accessible in room B–099 and on the Web at *http://ia.ita.doc.gov.*

Final Results of Review

We determine that the following weighted-average margins exist for the period February 1, 1998 through January 31, 1999:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Hunan Provincial Native Produce & Animal By-Products Import & Export Corp. ...	0.00
Hebei Founder Import & Export Company	30.02

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of natural bristle paint brushes and brush heads from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates shown above except that, for firms whose weighted-average margins are less than 0.5 percent and therefore *de minimis*, the Department shall require no deposit of estimated antidumping duties; (2) for previously-reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters with separate rates, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established for the most recent period; (3) for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC-wide rate, 351.92 percent; and (4) for all other non-PRC exporters of the subject merchandise, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter.

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

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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 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 section 351.305(a)(3) of the Department's regulations. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections 751 and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: July 13, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix—List of Issues

1. Factor Valuation and Usage Rates
   A. Surrogate Values of Material Inputs
   B. Material Input Weights
   C. Wooden Core
   D. Inflation of Surrogate Values
2. Non *Bona Fide* Sale
3. Scope
4. Clerical Errors

[FR Doc. 00–18810 Filed 7–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–433–808, A–822–804, A–570–860, A–560–811, A–588–855, A–580–844, A–449–804, A–841–804, A–455–803, A–821–812, A–823–809, A–307–819]

Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Austria, Belarus, Indonesia, Japan, Latvia, Moldova, the People's Republic of China, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, and Venezuela

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

ACTION: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 25, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Riggle or Tom Futtner at (202) 482–0650 and (202) 482–3814, respectively; Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Initiation of Investigations

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (2000).

The Petitions

On June 28, 2000, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received petitions filed in proper form by the Rebar Trade Action Coalition (RTAC), as well as its individual members [1] (hereinafter collectively, the petitioner). RTAC is an ad hoc trade association, the members of which are producers of the domestic like product in the alleged region. The Department received from RTAC information supplementing the petitions throughout the 20-day initiation period.

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Act, the petitioner alleges that imports of steel concrete reinforcing bars (rebar) from Austria, Belarus, Indonesia, Japan, the Republic of Korea (Korea), Latvia, Moldova, the People's Republic of China (the PRC), Poland, the Russian Federation (Russia), Ukraine, and Venezuela are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that the petitioner filed these petitions on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to each of the antidumping investigations that it is requesting the Department to initiate (*see* the following section below).

Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions

The petitioner alleges that there is a regional industry for the domestic like product and included data for both factors required by section 771(4)(C) of the Act: (1) The producers within such market sell all or almost all of their production of the like product in question in the regional market; and (2) the demand in the regional market is not supplied, to any substantial degree, by producers located elsewhere in the United States.[2] Moreover, the petitioner included data supporting its allegation that there is a concentration of dumped

[1] AmeriSteel; Auburn Steel Co., Inc.; Birmingham Steel Corp.; Border Steel, Inc.; Marion Steel Company; Riverview Steel; Nucor Steel and CMC Steel Group. Auburn Steel Co. is not a petitioner in the investigations involving rebar from Japan and Indonesia.

[2] The region identified by the petitioner consists of Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.