

## LIST OF PETITION ACTION BY TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR PERIOD 9/14/00–10/19/01—Continued

Firm name	Address	Date petition accepted	Product
Miss Beckey Seafood, Inc, d.b.a. Safe Harbor Seafood.	4371 Ocean Street, Mayport, FL 32233.	10/19/01	Shrimp, fish and other seafood.

The petitions were submitted pursuant to section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2341). Consequently, the United States Department of Commerce has initiated separate investigations to determine whether increased imports into the United States of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by each firm contributed importantly to total or partial separation of the firm's workers, or threat thereof, and to a decrease in sales or production of each petitioning firm.

Any party having a substantial interest in the proceedings may request a public hearing on the matter. A request for a hearing must be received by Trade Adjustment Assistance, Room 7315, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230, no later than the close of business of the tenth calendar day following the publication of this notice.

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance official program number and title of the program under which these petitions are submitted is 11.313, Trade Adjustment Assistance.

Dated: October 23, 2001.

**Anthony J. Meyer,**

*Coordinator, Trade Adjustment and Technical Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 01–27097 Filed 10–26–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–24–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–570–803]

#### Heavy Forged Hand Tools From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of New Shipper Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results in the antidumping duty new shipper administrative review of heavy forged hand tools from the People's Republic of China.

**SUMMARY:** On August 1, 2001, the Department of Commerce (Department)

published the preliminary results of the new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on hammers/sledges, one of the four antidumping duty orders on heavy forged hand tools (HFHTs) from the People's Republic of China (PRC). This review covers one manufacturer/exporter. The period of review (POR) is February 1, 2000 through July 31, 2000.

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 29, 2001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Esther Chen, Tom Martin, or Ron Trentham, AD/CVD Enforcement Group II, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–2305, (202) 482–3936 and (202) 482–6320, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Applicable Statute**

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

**Background**

The Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty orders on HFHTs from the PRC on February 19, 1991. *See Antidumping Duty Orders: Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles, From the People's Republic of China*, 56 FR 6622 (February 19, 1991). On July 20, 2000, the Department received a request from Shandong Jinma Industrial Group Co., Ltd. (Jinma) for a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on HFHTs covering hammers/sledges pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and section 351.214(b) of the Department's

regulations. These provisions state that, if the Department receives from an exporter or producer of the subject merchandise a request for review, which states that it did not export the merchandise to the United States during the period covered by the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation and that such exporter or producer is not affiliated with any exporter or producer who exported the subject merchandise during that period, then the Department shall conduct a new shipper review to establish an individual weighted-average dumping margin for the requesting exporter or producer, if the Department has not previously established such a margin for the exporter or producer. The regulations require the exporter or producer to include in its request: (1) Documentation establishing the date on which the merchandise was first entered, or withdrawn from the warehouse, for consumption, or, if it cannot establish the date of the first entry, the date on which it first shipped the merchandise for export to the United States, or if the merchandise has not yet been shipped or entered, the date of sale; (2) a list, with appropriate certifications, of the firms with which it is affiliated; (3) a certification from such exporter or producer, and from each affiliated firm, that they did not, under their current or former names, export the merchandise during the LTFV period of investigation (POI), and (4) in an antidumping proceeding involving inputs from a nonmarket economy country, a certification that the export activities of such exporter or producer are not controlled by the central government. *See* 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(ii), (iii), and (iv); Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) Accompanying the URAA, H.R. Doc. No. 103–316, vol. 1 (1994) at 875.

Jinma's request was accompanied by information and certifications establishing the date on which it first shipped the subject merchandise. Jinma also claimed it had no affiliated companies which exported hammers/sledges from the PRC during the POI. In addition, Jinma certified that its export activities are not controlled by the central government. Based on the above information, the Department initiated a

new shipper review covering Jinma. See *Heavy Forged Hand Tools From the People's Republic of China; Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Administrative Review*, 65 FR 59824 (October 6, 2000). On March 26, 2001, the Department published an extension of the deadline for completion of the preliminary results of this new shipper review until July 25, 2001. See *Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of New Shipper Antidumping Review: Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles, From the People's Republic of China*, 66 FR 16444 (March 26, 2001).

On August 1, 2001, the Department published the preliminary results of the new shipper review of Jinma with respect to the antidumping duty order on hammers/sledges from the PRC. See *Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review: Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles, From the People's Republic of China*, 66 FR 39733 (August 1, 2001). We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results of this review. On September 4, 2001, we received comments from the respondent Jinma. No rebuttal comments were received. The Department has now completed this new shipper review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

**Scope of Review**

HFHTs from the PRC comprise the following classes or kinds of merchandise: (1) Hammers and sledges with heads over 1.5 kg (3.33 pounds) (hammers/sledges); (2) bars over 18 inches in length, track tools and wedges (bars/wedges); (3) picks/mattocks; and (4) axes/adzes. This review covers shipments of one class or kind of merchandise, hammers and sledges with heads over 1.5 kg (3.33 pounds).

HFHTs include heads for drilling, hammers, sledges, axes, mauls, picks, and mattocks, which may or may not be painted, which may or may not be

finished, or which may or may not be imported with handles; assorted bar products and track tools including wrecking bars, digging bars and tampers; and steel wood splitting wedges. HFHTs are manufactured through a hot forge operation in which steel is sheared to required length, heated to forging temperature, and formed to final shape on forging equipment using dies specific to the desired product shape and size. Depending on the product, finishing operations may include shot-blasting, grinding, polishing and painting, and the insertion of handles for handled products. HFHTs are currently classifiable under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheadings: 8205.20.60, 8205.59.30, 8201.30.00, and 8201.40.60. Specifically excluded are hammers and sledges with heads 1.5 kg (3.33 pounds) in weight and under, hoes and rakes, and bars 18 inches in length and under. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of these orders is dispositive. This review covers the period February 1, 2000 through July 31, 2000.

**Analysis of Comments Received**

All issues raised in the briefs submitted by parties to this new shipper administrative review are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum for the New Shipper Review of Heavy Forged Hand Tools from the People's Republic of China—February 1, 2000 through July 31, 2000 from Bernard T. Carreau, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration, to Faryar Shirzad, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration (Decision Memorandum), dated concurrently with the review results and 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 Department positions in this public memorandum, which is on file at the U.S. Department of Commerce, in the Central Records Unit, room B-099. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum is accessible on the web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

**Changes Since the Preliminary Results**

Based on our analysis of comments received, we have made the following changes to the margin calculation:

1. For the surrogate value of wooden tool handles, the Department used Indian import data for HTS category 4417 during the period, April 1999 through February 2000. See Comment 1 of the Decision Memorandum.

2. For the surrogate value of electricity, the Department used an Indian electricity surrogate value obtained from the *Energy Data Directory & Yearbook 1999-2000 (TEDDY)*. See Comment 2 of the Decision Memorandum

3. In calculating surrogate values for the factors of production for HFHTs, the Department included all imports of inputs weighing under 100 kilograms unless the quantity or value was found to be aberrational. See Memorandum From Jeff Pedersen Regarding Factors of Production Valuation/Analysis Memorandum for the Final Results of the New Shipper Review of Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles (HFHTs), from the People's Republic of China (PRC) Shandong Jinma Industrial Group Co., Ltd. (Jinma) (Analysis Memorandum).

**Final Results of Review**

We determine that the following weighted-average margin percentage exists for the period February 1, 2000 through July 31, 2000:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Shandong Jinma Industrial Group Co., Ltd.: Hammers/Sledges .....	2/1/00-7/31/00	0.00

**Assessment**

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. While Jinma's calculated dumping margin is 0 percent, we have calculated importer-specific assessments for Jinma's sales to the United States. Where the importer-

specific assessment rate is above de minimis, we will instruct Customs to assess dumping duties on that importer's entries of subject merchandise.

**Cash Deposit Requirements**

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of

this notice of final results of the new shipper administrative review for all shipments of hammers/sledges from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a) of the Act: (1) For the exporter named above, no cash deposit will be required; (2) the cash deposit

rate for PRC exporters who received a separate rate in a prior segment of the proceeding will continue to be the rate assigned in the most recent segment of the proceeding during which they were reviewed; (3) the cash deposit rate for the PRC-wide entity (i.e., all other exporters, which have not been reviewed) will continue to be 27.71 percent; and (4) the cash deposit rate for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC 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.

#### Notification

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 doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO material or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanctions.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: October 23, 2001.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

#### Appendix—Issues in Decision Memorandum

##### Comments and Responses

1. Excluding aberrational data from the Indian import data used in valuing wooden tool handles
2. Use of *TEDDY* for Indian electricity surrogate values

[FR Doc. 01–27165 Filed 10–26–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

#### Defense Science Board

**AGENCY:** Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Notice of Advisory Committee Meetings.

**SUMMARY:** The Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on Aircraft Carriers of the Future will meet in closed session on October 22–23, 2001; November 5–7, 2001; November 15–16, 2001; December 11–12, 2001; January 16–17, 2001; February 21–22, 2002; and March 13–14, 2002. All meetings will be held at Strategic Analysis Inc., 3601 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22201, with the exception of the November 5–7 and November 15–16 meetings, which will be held in San Diego, CA. The Task Force will assess how aircraft carriers should serve the nation's defense needs in the 21st Century and beyond.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology & Logistics on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. At these meetings, the Task Force will examine the expected naval environment and the role of the Navy for the next 20–50 years; the role of the carrier and the carrier battle group in a joint environment in which technology has progressed at an appropriate pace for both the U.S. and its potential adversaries; the effects of Unmanned Combat Air Vehicles on the role of the carrier and the carrier battle group; how the carrier should evolve or be transformed to best meet mission requirements in a joint environment; how the role of the aircraft carrier might change and the characteristics that might affect the change; and the technology improvement barriers that need to be overcome to significantly improve the ability of the carrier to execute its missions.

In accordance with Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. No. 92–463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. II), it has been determined that these DSB Task Force meetings concern matters listed in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1), and that accordingly these meetings will be closed to the public.

Dated: October 23, 2001.

**L. M. Bynum,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 01–27064 Filed 10–26–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–08–M

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**SUMMARY:** The Acting Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before December 28, 2001.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Acting Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.