

Office of the Port Director, U.S. Customs Service, 2831 Talleyrand Avenue, Jacksonville, FL 32206.

Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 4008, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: December 5, 2000.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-31755 Filed 12-12-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 1130]

Expansion of Foreign-Trade Zone 94; Laredo, TX

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, the City of Laredo, Texas, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 94, submitted an application to the Board for authority to expand FTZ 94 to include a site at the Unitec Industrial Center located in Laredo (Site 6), within the Laredo Customs port of entry (FTZ Docket 7-2000; filed 3/3/00);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 12970, 3/10/00) and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations are satisfied, and that the proposal is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby orders: The application to expand FTZ 94 is approved, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28, and further subject to the Board's standard 2,000-acre activation limit.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 28th day of November 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

Dennis Puccinelli,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-31750 Filed 12-12-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-549-813]

Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Determination Not To Revoke Order in Part: Canned Pineapple Fruit From Thailand

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

SUMMARY: On August 8, 2000, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit from Thailand. This review covers nine producers/exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review (POR) is July 1, 1998, through June 30, 1999. Based on our analysis of comments received, these final results differ from the preliminary results. The final results are listed below in the "Final Results of Review" section. Furthermore, we are not revoking the antidumping duty order with respect to Malee Sampran Public Co., Ltd. (Malee) given that shipments of this company's subject merchandise to the United States have not been made in commercial quantities for each of the three consecutive review periods that formed the basis of the revocation request.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 13, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Constance Handley or Charles Riggle, Office 5, Group II, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0631 and (202) 482-0650, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 Department regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1999).

Background

This review covers the following producers/exporters of merchandise subject to the antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit from

Thailand: Vita Food Factory (1989) Co., Ltd. (Vita); Siam Fruit Canning (1988) Co., Ltd. (SIFCO); Siam Food Products Public Co. Ltd. (SFP); The Thai Pineapple Public Co., Ltd. (TIPCO); Malee; The Prachuab Fruit Canning Company Ltd. (PRAFT); Thai Pineapple Canning Industry (TPC); Tropical Food Industries Co., Ltd. (TROFCO); and Kuiburi Fruit Canning Co. Ltd. (KFC).

On August 8, 2000, the Department published the preliminary results of this review. *See Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Preliminary Determination Not to Revoke Order in Part: Canned Pineapple Fruit From Thailand*, 65 FR 48450 (*Preliminary Results*). On September 7 and 14, 2000, we received case briefs and/or rebuttal briefs, respectively, from the petitioners,¹ SFP, TIPCO, Malee, TPC, and SIFCO.

Scope of Review

The product covered by this review is canned pineapple fruit (CPF). CPF is defined as pineapple processed and/or prepared into various product forms, including rings, pieces, chunks, tidbits, and crushed pineapple, that is packed and cooked in metal cans with either pineapple juice or sugar syrup added. CPF is currently classifiable under subheadings 2008.20.0010 and 2008.20.0090 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). HTSUS 2008.20.0010 covers CPF packed in a sugar-based syrup; HTSUS 2008.20.0090 covers CPF packed without added sugar (*i.e.*, juice-packed). Although these HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and for customs purposes, our written description of the scope is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" (Decision Memorandum) from Holly A. Kuga, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration, to Troy H. Cribb, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated December 6, 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 Memorandum, is attached to this notice as an Appendix. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding

¹ The petitioners in this case are Maui Pineapple Company and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B-099 of the main Department building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Internet at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Determination Not To Revoke Order

For the reasons outlined in the Decision Memorandum, we have determined not to revoke the antidumping duty order with respect to subject merchandise produced and also exported by Malee, because its sales were not made in commercial quantities in accordance with 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1)(ii).

Fair Value Comparisons

We calculated export price (EP) and normal value (NV) based on the same methodology used in the preliminary results. We corrected clerical errors with respect to Malee and TPC.

Cost of Production

We calculated the COP based on the same methodology used in the preliminary results, with the exception of PRAFT. For PRAFT we used the five-year historical net realizable value ratio for calculating the fruit cost used in the COP. For a further discussion of this issue, see the Decision Memorandum, Comment 4. We corrected clerical errors with respect to SFP.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following percentage weighted-average margins exist for the period July 1, 1998, through June 30, 1999:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Siam Food Products Company Ltd	0.37
The Thai Pineapple Public Company, Ltd	1.95
Kuiburi Fruit Canning Co. Ltd	1.63
Thai Pineapple Canning Industry Siam Fruit Canning (1988) Co. Ltd	3.42
Vita Food Factory (1989) Co. Ltd	1.31
The Prachuab Fruit Canning Company Ltd	5.19
Tropical Food Industries Co., Ltd	2.16
Malee Sampran Public Co., Ltd	4.02
	1.04

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates by

dividing the dumping margin found on the subject merchandise examined by the entered value of such merchandise. Where the import-specific assessment rate is above *de minimis* we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on that importer's entries of subject merchandise.

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 administrative review, as provided by section 751(a) of the Act: (1) For the companies named above, the cash deposit rate will be the rate listed above, except where the margins are zero or *de minimis* no cash deposit will be required, (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published in the most recent final results in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in these final results of review or in the most recent segment of the proceeding in which that manufacturer participated; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 24.64 percent, the all others rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. 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 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 in the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also is the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return/destruction or conversion to judicial protective order of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3).

Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 6, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix—Issues Covered in Decision Memorandum

- I. ISSUES SPECIFIC TO MALEE
 - Comment 1: Revocation
 - Comment 2: Imputed Credit Expenses
 - Comment 3: Export Price (EP) vs. Constructed Export Price (CEP)
- II. ISSUES SPECIFIC TO PRAFT
 - Comment 4: Fruit Cost Allocation
 - Comment 5: Direct vs. Indirect Selling Expenses
- III. ISSUES SPECIFIC TO SIFCO
 - Comment 6: Correction of Errors in Database
 - Comment 7: Calculation of General and Administrative (G&A) Expense Ratio
 - Comment 8: Calculation of Interest Expense Ratio
- IV. ISSUES SPECIFIC TO TIPCO
 - Comment 9: Expenses Related to Compliance with the Antidumping Duty Order
 - Comment 10: Foreign Exchange Gains and Losses
 - Comment 11: Calculation of Interest Expense Ratio
 - Comment 12: Offset to G&A
 - Comment 13: Purchase of Input from Affiliated Party
 - Comment 14: Offset to Cost of Manufacturing (COM)
 - Comment 15: Clerical Error Allegation
- V. ISSUES SPECIFIC TO TPC
 - Comment 16: Date of Sale
 - Comment 17: EP vs. CEP
 - Comment 18: Allocation of G&A to Arbitrage Activity
 - Comment 19: Allocation of Interest Expense to Arbitrage Activity
 - Comment 20: Clerical Error Allegation
- VI. ISSUES SPECIFIC TO SFP
 - Comment 21: Clerical Error Allegation

[FR Doc. 00-31751 Filed 12-12-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-475-818]

Certain Pasta From Italy: 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 and determination to revoke the antidumping duty order in part: Certain pasta from Italy.