speakers will need to register prior to the open forum period. The committee welcomes the public's written comments on committee business at any time.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Direct questions regarding this meeting to Tom Knappenberger, Public Affairs Officer, at (360) 891–5005, or write Forest Headquarters Office, Gifford Pinchot National Forest, 10600 NE 51st Circle, Vancouver, WA 98682.

Dated: July 1, 2002.

Claire Lavendel,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 02–17158 Filed 7–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–601]

Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of 2000–2001 Administrative Review, Partial Rescission of Review, and Notice of Intent to Revoke Order in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of 2000–2001 administrative review, partial rescission of the review, and notice of intent to revoke order in part.

SUMMARY: We preliminarily determine that sales of tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from the People's Republic of China, were made below normal value during the period June 1, 2000, through May 31, 2001. We are also rescinding the review, in part, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

Tianshui Hailin Import and Export Corporation and Hailin Bearing Factory, Wanxiang Group Corporation, and Zhejiang Machinery Import & Export Corp. have requested revocation of the antidumping duty order in part. Based on record evidence, we preliminarily find that only Tianshui Hailin Import and Export Corporation and Hailin Bearing Factory qualifies for revocation. Accordingly, we preliminarily determine to revoke the order with respect to the subject merchandise produced and exported by Tianshui Hailin Import and Export Corporation and Hailin Bearing Factory, but not with respect to the subject merchandise produced and exported by the other two companies.

If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the differences between the export price or constructed export price and normal value on all appropriate entries. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 9, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Melani Miller, S. Anthony Grasso, or Andrew Smith, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0116, (202) 482–3853, or (202) 482–1276, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), are references to the provisions effective 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 references to the Department of Commerce's (''the Department'') regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (April 2001).

Background

On May 27, 1987, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (52 FR 19748) the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished (''TRBs''), from the People's Republic of China (''PRC''). The Department notified interested parties of the opportunity to request an administrative review of this order on June 11, 2001 (66 FR 31203). On June 28, 2001, Zhejiang Machinery Import & Export Corp. (''ZMC'') requested an administrative review, and also requested that the Department revoke the antidumping duty order as it pertains to that company. On June 29, 2001, Wanxiang Group Corporation (''Wanxiang''), China National Machinery Import & Export Corporation (''CMC''), Tianshui Hailin Import and Export Corporation and Hailin Bearing Factory (''Hailin''), Luoyang Bearing Corporation (Group) (''Luoyang''), and Weihai Machinery Holding (Group) Co., Ltd. (''Weihai'') also requested administrative reviews. Hailin, Weihai, and Wanxiang also requested that the Department revoke the antidumping duty order as it pertains to them. Also on June 29, 2001, the petitioner, The Timken Company, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on hundreds of PRC TRBs exporters. The petitioner revised its request on July 10, 2001. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(b)(1), we published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on July 23, 2001 (66 FR 38252).

On August 6, 2001, Chin Jun Industrial Ltd. (''Chin Jun'') reported that it had no shipments of subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review (''POR''), June 1, 2000, through May 31, 2001. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), we preliminarily conclude that there were no shipments from Chin Jun to the United States during the POR and are preliminarily rescinding the review with respect to this company. However, prior to issuing the final results, we will confirm with the Customs Service that Chin Jun had no shipments during the POR.

On August 14, 2001, we sent a questionnaire to the Secretary General of the Basic Machinery Division of the Chamber of Commerce for Import & Export of Machinery and Electronics Products and requested that the questionnaire be forwarded to all PRC companies identified in our initiation notice and to any subsidiary companies of the named companies that produce and/or export the subject merchandise. In this letter, we also requested information relevant to the issue of whether the companies named in the initiation notice are independent from government control. *See* the ''Separate Rates Determination'' section, below. Courtesy copies of the questionnaire were also sent to companies with legal representation.

We received responses to the questionnaire in September and October 2001 from the following seven companies: Liaoning MEC Group Co. Ltd. (''Liaoning''), CMC, ZMC, Wanxiang, Hailin, Weihai, and Luoyang. With respect to Liaoning, on September 21, 2001, we rejected Liaoning's Section A questionnaire response because neither the petitioner nor Liaoning had requested an administrative review and we did not consider Liaoning to be a respondent in the instant proceeding. The petitioner submitted comments on the remaining questionnaire responses in November 2001. We sent out supplemental questionnaires to CMC, ZMC, Wanxiang, Hailin, Weihai, and Luoyang in November and December 2001, and January, March, and April 2002, and received responses to these supplemental questionnaires in December 2001 and January, March, April, and May 2002.

On April 4, 2002, Weihai withdrew its request for a review. The petitioner did not request a review for Weihai. While Weihai's rescission request was made more than 90 days after initiation, 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) provides that the Department may extend this deadline, and it is the Department's practice to do so where it poses no undue burden on the parties or on the Department. Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), we have rescinded the review with respect to Weihai. For a complete discussion of this decision *see* the Memorandum from Team to Susan Kuhbach, ''Partial Rescission of Review,'' dated May 20, 2002.

Scope of the Order

Merchandise covered by this order includes TRBs and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from the PRC; flange, take up cartridge, and hanger units incorporating tapered roller bearings; and tapered roller housings (except pillow blocks) incorporating tapered rollers, with or without spindles, whether or not for automotive use. This merchandise is currently classifiable under *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* of the United States (''HTSUS'') item numbers 8482.20.00, 8482.91.00.50, 8482.99.30, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.30.80, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.80, 8708.99.80.15, and 8708.99.80.80. Although the HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, in May 2002, we verified information provided by Hailin using standard verification procedures, including onsite inspection of manufacturers' facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information.

Separate Rates Determination

The Department has treated the PRC as a nonmarket economy (''NME'') country in all previous antidumping cases. In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country is an NME shall remain in effect until revoked by the Department. None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment in this review. Moreover, parties to this proceeding have not argued that the PRC TRBs industry is a market-oriented industry.

Therefore, we are treating the PRC as an NME country within the meaning of section 773(c) of the Act. We allow companies in NME countries to receive separate antidumping duty rates for purposes of assessment and cash deposits when those companies can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to export activities.

To establish whether a company operating in an NME country is sufficiently independent to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under the test established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China*, 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991) (''*Sparklers*''), as amplified by the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China*, 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994) (''*Silicon Carbide*''). Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of *de jure* absence of government control over export activities includes:

1) an absence of restrictive stipulations associated with the individual exporter's business and export licenses; 2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and 3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. *De facto* absence of government control over exports is based on four factors: 1) whether each exporter sets its own export prices independently of the government and without the approval of a government authority; 2) whether each exporter retains the proceeds from its sales and makes independent decisions regarding the disposition of profits or financing of losses; 3) whether each exporter has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements; and 4) whether each exporter has autonomy from the government regarding the selection of management (*see Silicon Carbide*, 59 FR at 22587, and *Sparklers*, 56 FR at 20589).

In previous administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on TRBs from the PRC, we determined that CMC, Luoyang, Hailin, Wanxiang, and ZMC, should receive separate rates (*see, e.g., Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of 1999–2000 Administrative Review, Partial Rescission of Review, and Determination Not to Revoke Order in Part*, 66 FR 57420 (November 15, 2001) (''*TRBs XIII*''). We preliminarily determine that the evidence on the record of this review also demonstrates an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to these companies' exports according to the criteria identified in *Sparklers* and *Silicon Carbide*. The evidence in question consists of, among other things, the companies' business licenses and copies of relevant PRC laws on trade and incorporation. Therefore, we have continued to assign each of these companies a separate rate.

Additionally, we have preliminarily determined that companies which did not respond to the questionnaire should not receive separate rates. *See* the ''Use of Facts Otherwise Available'' section, below.

Use of Facts Otherwise Available

We preliminarily determine that companies that did not respond to our requests for information did not cooperate to the best of their abilities. Thus, in accordance with sections 776(a) and (b) of the Act, the use of adverse facts available is appropriate for such companies.

Companies that did not respond to the questionnaire: Where the Department must base its determination on facts available because a respondent failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with a request for information, section 776(b) of the Act authorizes the Department to use an inference that is adverse to the interests of that respondent in choosing facts available. Section 776(b) of the Act also authorizes the Department to use as adverse facts available information derived from the petition, the final determination in the investigation, a previous administrative review, or any other information placed on the record. Information from prior segments of the proceeding constitutes secondary information and section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that secondary information with independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action provides that ''corroborate'' means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value (*see* H.R. Doc. 316, Vol. 1, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 870 (1994)).

To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, unlike other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. Thus, in an administrative review, if the Department chooses as total adverse facts available a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding, it is not

necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period. With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin inappropriate. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin (*see, e.g., Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 6812, 6814 (February 22, 1996) (where the Department

disregarded the highest margin as adverse facts available because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expenses resulting in an unusually high margin)).

We have preliminarily assigned a margin of 33.18 percent to those companies for which we initiated a review that did not respond to the questionnaire. This margin, calculated for sales by Xiangfan Machinery Import & Export (Group) Corp. during the 1996–1997 review (*Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of 1996–1997 Antidumping Administrative Review and New Shipper Review and Determination Not to Revoke Order in Part*, 63 FR 63842 (November 17, 1998)), represents the highest overall margin for any firm during any segment of this proceeding. As discussed above, it is not necessary to question the reliability of a calculated margin from a prior segment of the proceeding. Further, there are no circumstances or documentation indicating that this margin is inappropriate as adverse facts available. Therefore, we preliminarily find that the 33.18 percent rate is corroborated.

As noted in the ''Separate Rates Determination'' section above, we have also preliminarily determined that the non-responsive companies should not receive separate rates. Thus, they are viewed as part of the PRC-wide entity. Accordingly, the facts available for these companies form the basis for the PRC rate, which is 33.18 percent for this review.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For certain sales made by CMC to the United States, we used constructed export price (''CEP'') in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act because the first sale to an unaffiliated purchaser occurred after importation of the merchandise into the United States. For sales made by other respondents, as well as the remaining sales made by CMC, we used export price (''EP''), in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States prior to importation into the United States and because the CEP methodology was not indicated by other circumstances.

We calculated EP based on the FOB or CIF prices to unaffiliated purchasers, as appropriate. From these prices we deducted amounts, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, international freight, and marine insurance. We valued the deductions for foreign inland freight using surrogate data (Indian freight costs). (We selected India as the surrogate country for the reasons explained in the ''Normal Value'' section of this notice, below.) When marine insurance and ocean freight were provided by PRC-owned companies, we valued the deductions using surrogate data (amounts charged by market-economy providers). However, when some or all of a specific company's ocean freight was provided directly by market economy companies and paid for in a market economy currency, we used the reported market economy ocean freight values for all U.S. sales made by that company.

We calculated CEP based on the delivered and duty paid prices from CMC's U.S. subsidiary to unaffiliated customers. We made deductions, where appropriate, from the starting price for CEP for foreign inland freight, international freight, marine insurance, U.S. inland freight, and customs duties. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we made further deductions for the following selling expenses that related to economic activity in the United States: credit expenses and indirect selling expenses, including inventory carrying costs. In accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we have deducted from the starting price an amount for profit.

Normal Value

Section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine normal value (''NV'') using a factors-of-production (''FOP'') methodology if: (1) the subject merchandise is exported from an NME country, and (2) the Department finds that the available information does not permit the calculation of NV under section 773(a) of the Act. We have no basis to determine that the available information would permit the calculation of NV using PRC prices or costs. Therefore, we calculated NV based on factors data in accordance with sections 773(c)(3) and (4) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.408(c).

Under the FOP methodology, we are required to value, to the extent possible, the NME producer's inputs in a market economy country that is at a comparable level of economic development and that is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. We chose India as the surrogate country on the basis of the criteria set out in 19 CFR 351.408(b). See the October 19, 2001, Memorandum to John Brinkmann from Jeff May ''Tapered Roller Bearings from the People's Republic of China: Nonmarket Economy Status and Surrogate Country Selection,'' and the July 1, 2002, Memorandum to Susan Kuhbach ''Selection of a Surrogate Country and Steel Value Sources'' (''*Steel Values Memorandum*'') for a further discussion of our surrogate selection. (Both memoranda are on file in the Department's Central Records Unit, which is located in Room B–099 of the main Department building (''CRU'').)

We used publicly available information on Indian imports and exports to India to value the various factors. Because some of the Indian import data was not contemporaneous with the POR, unless otherwise noted, we inflated the data to the POR using the Indian wholesale price index (''WPI'') published by the International Monetary Fund.

Pursuant to the Department's FOP methodology, we valued each respondent's reported factors of production by multiplying them by the values described below. For a complete description of the factor values used, *see* the Memorandum to Susan Kuhbach: ''Factors of Production Values Used for the Preliminary Results,'' dated July 1, 2002, which is on file in the Department's CRU.

1. **Steel Inputs**. For hot-rolled alloy steel bars used in the production of cups and cones, consistent with *TRBs XIII* and Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of New Shipper Reviews, 67 FR 10665 (March 8, 2002) (''*TRBs 2000 NSR*''), we used an adjusted weighted-average of Japanese export values to India from the Japanese Harmonized Schedule (''HS'') category 7228.30.900 obtained from Official Japan Ministry of Finance statistics. We used this same value for the hot-rolled steel bar used in the production of spacers. For cold-rolled steel rods used in the production of rollers and for cold-rolled steel sheet used in the production of cages, we used Indian import data under Indian tariff subheadings 7228.5009 and 7209.1600, respectively, obtained from the *Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India, Vol. II - Imports*. For

further discussion of selection of steel value sources, *see* the *Steel Values Memorandum*.

As in previous administrative reviews in this proceeding, we eliminated from our calculation steel imports from NME countries and imports from market economy countries that were made in small quantities. For steel used in the production of cups, cones, spacers, and rollers, we also excluded as necessary imports from countries that do not produce bearing-quality steel (*see*, *e.g.*, *TRBs XIII*). We made adjustments to include freight costs incurred using the shorter of the reported distances from either the closest PRC port to the TRBs factory or the domestic supplier to the TRBs factory. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Collated Roofing Nails From the People's Republic of China*, 62 FR 51410 (October 1, 1997) and *Sigma Corporation v. United States*, 117 F. 3d 1401 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Certain producers in this review purchased steel used to make TRBs or TRB parts from market economy suppliers and paid for the steel with market economy currency. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.408(c)(1), we generally valued these steel inputs using the actual price reported for directly imported inputs from a market economy. However, in *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of 1998–1999 Administrative Review, Partial Rescission of Review, and Notice of Intent to Revoke Order in Part*, 66 FR 1953 (January 10, 2001) and *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China; Amended Final Results of 1998–1999 Administrative Review and Determination to Revoke Order in Part*, 66 FR 11562 (February 26, 2001) (collectively, ''*TRBs XII*'') and *TRBs XIII*, we found a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that certain market economy steel inputs purchased by PRC TRBs manufacturers and used to manufacture TRBs were subsidized. Consistent with our treatment of subsidized inputs in *TRBs XII* and *TRBs XIII*, we have not used the actual prices paid by PRC producers of TRBs for steel which we have continuing reason to believe or suspect is subsidized. Instead, we relied on surrogate values. (*See* individual company calculation memoranda for a more detailed company-specific discussion of this issue.)

We valued scrap recovered from the production of cups, cones, rollers, and spacers using Indian import statistics from Indian HS category 7204.2909. Scrap recovered from the production of cages was valued using import data from Indian HS category 7204.4100.

2. **Labor**. 19 CFR 351.408(c)(3) requires the use of a regression-based wage rate. We have used the regression-based wage rate available on Import Administration's internet website at www.ia.ita.doc.gov/wages.

3. **Overhead, SG&A Expenses, and Profit**. For factory overhead, we used information obtained from the fiscal year 2000–2001 annual reports of five Indian bearing producers. We calculated factory overhead and selling, general, and administrative expenses as percentages of direct inputs and applied these ratios to each producer's direct input costs. These expenses were calculated exclusive of labor and electricity, but included employer provident funds and welfare expenses not reflected in the Department's regressed wage rate. This is consistent with the methodology we utilized in *TRBs XIII* and *TRBs 2000 NSR*. For profit, we totaled the reported profit before taxes for the five Indian bearing producers and divided by the total calculated cost of production (''COP'') of goods sold. This percentage was applied to each respondent's total COP to derive a company-specific profit value.

4. **Packing**. Consistent with our methodology in prior reviews (*see*, *e.g.*, *TRBs XIII*), we calculated packing costs as a percentage of COP for each respondent based on company-specific information submitted in previous reviews. This ratio was applied to each respondent's COP for the current review.

5. **Electricity**. We calculated our surrogate value for electricity based on electricity rate data from the *Energy Data Directory and Yearbook (1999/2000)* published by Tata Energy Research Institute. We calculated a simple average of the rates for the ''industrial'' category listed for 19 Indian states or electricity boards. We adjusted the electricity value to the POR using the Reserve Bank of India electricity-specific price index.

6. **Foreign Inland Freight**. We valued truck freight using an average of November 1999 truck freight rate quotes collected from Indian trucking companies by the Department and used in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Bulk Aspirin from the People's Republic of China*, 65 FR 33805 (May 25, 2000) (''*Bulk Aspirin from the PRC*'') and in past TRBs reviews (*see*, *e.g.*, *TRBs XIII* and *TRBs 2000 NSR*). We valued rail freight using two November 1999 rate quotes for domestic bearing quality steel shipments within India which were also used in *Bulk Aspirin from the PRC*. For inland freight expenses incurred by boat, we used August 1993 shipping freight data used in *Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 65 FR 31143 (May 16, 2000). We inflated these inland shipping rates to the POR using the Indian WPI.

7. **Ocean Freight**. We calculated a value for ocean freight based on December 2000 rate quotes from Maersk Sealand, Inc. Because this information is contemporaneous with the POR, no adjustments were necessary.

8. **Marine Insurance**. Consistent with *TRBs XIII* and *TRBs 2000 NSR*, we calculated a value for marine insurance based on the CIF value of shipped TRBs based on a rate obtained by the Department through queries made directly to an international marine insurance provider. We adjusted this marine insurance rate to the POR using the U.S. purchase price index.

9. **Brokerage and Handling**. We used the public version of a U.S. sales listing reported in the questionnaire response submitted by Meltroll Engineering for *Stainless Steel Bar from India; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Review and Partial Rescission of Administrative Review*, 65 FR 48965 (August 10, 2000). Because this information is not contemporaneous with the POR, we adjusted the data to the POR by using the Indian WPI.

Revocation

The Department ''may revoke, in whole or in part'' an antidumping duty order upon completion of a review under section 751 of the Act. While Congress has not specified the procedures that the Department must follow in revoking an order, the Department has developed a procedure for revocation that is described in 19 CFR 351.222. This regulation requires, inter alia, that a company requesting revocation must submit the following: (1) A certification that the company has sold the subject merchandise at not less than NV in the current review period and that the company will not sell at less than NV in the future; (2) a certification that the company sold the subject merchandise in each of the three years forming the basis of the request in commercial quantities; and (3) an agreement to reinstatement of the order if the Department concludes that the company, subsequent to the revocation, sold subject merchandise at less than NV. *See* 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1).

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1), Hailin, Wanxiang, and ZMC requested revocation of the antidumping duty order as it pertains to them. As noted above, Weihai also requested revocation of the antidumping duty order, in part, on this same basis. However, as we are rescinding this review with respect to Weihai, as discussed above, no further analysis is required with respect to partial revocation of the antidumping duty order as it pertains to Weihai.

According to 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2), upon receipt of such a request, the Department may revoke an order, in part, if it concludes that (1) the company in question has sold subject merchandise at not less than NV for a period of at least three consecutive years; (2) the continued application of the antidumping duty order is not otherwise necessary to offset dumping; and (3) the company has agreed to its immediate reinstatement in the order if the Department concludes that the company, subsequent to the revocation, sold subject merchandise at less than NV.

With respect to ZMC, as noted below, we preliminarily find that a dumping margin exists for ZMC in the instant review. Moreover, in *TRBs XII*, ZMC was found to have made sales below NV. Because ZMC does not have three consecutive years of sales at not less than NV, we preliminarily find that ZMC does not qualify for revocation of the order on TRBs pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(b).

As for Wanxiang, in *TRBs XII* and *TRBs XIII*, we determined that Wanxiang did not qualify for revocation because it did not sell the subject merchandise in the United States in commercial quantities in each of the three years underlying its request for revocation, specifically *TRBs XII*. In the instant review, based on our previous determination that Wanxiang did not make sales in commercial quantities during at least one of the three years forming the basis of the revocation request, *TRBs XII*, we do not need to examine whether Wanxiang made sales in commercial quantities in either of the other two years underlying Wanxiang's request for revocation. Thus, because Wanxiang did not make sales in commercial quantities in each of the three years cited by the company to support its revocation request, we preliminarily find that Wanxiang does not qualify for revocation of the order on TRBs pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(b).

Finally, with respect to Hailin, Hailin sold the subject merchandise at not less than NV for a period of at least three consecutive years. Hailin has also agreed in writing to the immediate reinstatement in the order, as long as any exporter or producer is subject to the order, if the Department concludes that Hailin, subsequent to the revocation, sold the subject merchandise at less than NV. Finally, based on our examination of the sales data submitted by Hailin (see Hailin's July 1, 2002, preliminary results calculation memorandum, which is on file in the Department's CRU, for our commercial quantities analysis with respect to this data), we preliminarily determine that Hailin sold the subject merchandise in the United States in commercial quantities in each of the three years cited by Hailin to support its request for revocation. Therefore, based on the above facts, and absent evidence on the record that the continued application of the antidumping order is otherwise necessary to offset dumping from Hailin, we preliminarily determine that Hailin qualifies for revocation of the order on TRBs pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2), and that the order with respect to merchandise produced and exported by Hailin should be revoked.

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margins exist for the period June 1, 2000, through May 31, 2001:

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin percentage
China National ..... Machinery Import ..... & Export Corporation	0.67
Wanxiang Group ..... Corporation	0.00
Tianshui Hailin Import and Export Corporation and Hailin Bearing Factory	0.00
Luoyang Bearing ..... Corporation (Group)	0.05 (*de minimis*)
Zhejiang Machinery ..... Import & Export Corp.	0.55
PRC-wide rate	33.18

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held approximately 42 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Issues raised in hearings will be limited to those raised in the case and rebuttal briefs. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 35 days after the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this review are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument with an electronic version included.

The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs or hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. To calculate the amount of duties to be assessed with respect to EP sales, we divided the total dumping margins (calculated as the difference between NV and EP) for each importer/customer by the total number of units sold to that importer/customer. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will direct the Customs Service to assess the resulting per-unit dollar amount against each unit of merchandise in each of that importer's/customer's entries under the order during the review period.

For CEP sales, we divided the total dumping margins for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of those reviewed sales for each importer/customer. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will direct the Customs Service to assess the resulting percentage margin against the entered customs values for the subject merchandise on each of that importer's/customer's entries during the review period.

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) for the PRC companies named above, the cash deposit rates will be the rates for these firms established in the final results of this review, except that, for exporters with de minimis rates, i.e., less than 0.50 percent, no deposit will be required; (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 during which they were reviewed; (3) for all other PRC exporters, the rate will be the PRC country-wide rate, which is 33.18 percent; and (4) for all other non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter. These deposit

requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a preliminary 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 the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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

Dated: July 1, 2002

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration

[FR Doc. 02–17033 Filed 7–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 1235]

Expansion of Foreign-Trade Zone 143, Sacramento, California Area

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 Sacramento-Yolo Port District, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 143, submitted an application to the Board for authority to expand FTZ 143 to include a new site (Site 4) at the McClellan Park (the former McClellan Air Force Base) in the San Francisco Customs port of entry area (FTZ Docket 2–2002; filed 1/7/02);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 1959, 1/15/02) 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 the 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 143 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 27th day of June 2002.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

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

[FR Doc. 02–17031 Filed 7–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No.1234]

Grant of Authority for Subzone Status, Mitsubishi Power Systems, Inc. (Power Generation Turbine Components), Orlando, FL

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 Foreign-Trade Zones Act provides for ''* * * the establishment * * * of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes,'' and authorizes the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs ports of entry;

Whereas, the Board's regulations (15 CFR Part 400) provide for the establishment of special-purpose subzones when existing zone facilities cannot serve the specific use involved, and when the activity results in a significant public benefit and is in the public interest;

Whereas, the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 42, has made application for authority to establish special-purpose subzone status at the power generation turbine components repair/manufacturing plant of Mitsubishi Power Systems, Inc., located in Orlando, Florida (FTZ Docket 45–2001, filed 1–6–2001);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 57032, 11–14–2001); 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 approval of the application is in the public interest;

Now, therefore, the Board hereby grants authority for subzone status at the power generation turbine components repair/manufacturing plant of Mitsubishi Power Systems, Inc., located in Orlando, Florida (Subzone 42A), at the location described in the application, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 27th day of July, 2002.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

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

Attest:

Pierre V. Duy,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–17030 Filed 7–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 1236]

Expansion of Foreign-Trade Zone 35, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Area

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 Philadelphia Regional Port Authority, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 35, submitted an application to the Board for authority to expand FTZ status to a site (66 acres) at the Fort Washington Exposition Center located in Fort Washington, Pennsylvania (Site 9), adjacent to the Philadelphia Customs port of entry (FTZ Docket 35–2001; filed 8/28/01);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 46599, 9/6/01) 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 35 is approved, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.