

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 885]

**Expansion of Foreign Trade Zone 168  
Dallas/Fort Worth, Texas, Area Fort  
Worth, 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, an application from the Dallas/Fort Worth Maquila Trade Development Corporation, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 168, for authority to expand its general-purpose zone to include a site at the Mercantile Center, Fort Worth (Tarrant County), Texas, within the Dallas/Fort Worth Customs port of entry, was filed by the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board on April 3, 1996 (Docket 27-96, 61 FR 17875, 4/23/96);

Whereas notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations; and,

Whereas the Board has found that the requirements of the Act and the regulations are satisfied, and that the proposal is in the public interest;

Now Therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The grantee is authorized to expand its zone as requested in the application, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 8th day of May 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

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

[FR Doc. 97-13665 Filed 5-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 886]

**Expansion of Foreign-Trade Zone 168  
Dallas/Fort Worth, Texas, Area  
Carrollton, 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, an application from the Dallas/Fort Worth Maquila Trade Development Corporation, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 168, for

authority to expand its general-purpose zone to include a site at the Frankford Trade Center, Carrollton (Denton County), Texas, adjacent to the Dallas/Fort Worth Customs port of entry, was filed by the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board on May 30, 1996 (Docket 47-96, 61 FR 29531, 6/11/96);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board has found that the requirements of the Act and the regulations are satisfied, and that the proposal is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The grantee is authorized to expand its zone as requested in the application, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 8th day of May 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

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

[FR Doc. 97-13666 Filed 5-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 889]

**Expansion of Foreign-Trade Zone 165,  
Midland, Texas, 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, an application from the City of Midland, Texas, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 165, for authority to expand its general-purpose zone to include a site at the Pecos County Airport Industrial Park, Fort Stockton (Pecos County), Texas, adjacent to the Midland International Airport (a U.S. Customs user-fee airport) filed by the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board on May 29, 1996 (Docket 46-96, 61 FR 29530, 6/11/96);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board has found that the requirements of the Act and the regulations are satisfied, and that the proposal is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The grantee is authorized to expand its zone as requested in the application, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of May 1997.

**Jeffrey P. Bialos,**

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

[FR Doc. 97-13668 Filed 5-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 40-97]

**Foreign-Trade Zone 137—Washington  
Dulles International Airport, Virginia;  
Application for Expansion**

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) by Washington Dulles Foreign Trade Zone, Inc., grantee of FTZ 137, requesting authority to expand its zone in Loudoun County, Virginia, within the Washington, DC, 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 May 8, 1997.

FTZ 137 was approved on April 17, 1987 (Board Order 350, 52 F.R. 13489, 4/23/87). The zone project currently consists of the following sites (250 acres): *Site 1*—within the Washington Dulles International Airport complex, Fairfax and Loudoun Counties; and, *Site 2*—warehouse facility, 110 Terminal Drive, Sterling.

This application is requesting authority to expand the general-purpose zone to include an additional site (proposed *Site 3*—161 acres)—located near the intersection of Routes 606 and 621, Loudoun County, two miles west of Washington Dulles International Airport. The site is being developed as an industrial park by Hazout, S.A., the owner of the property. No 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 July 22, 1997. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to August 6, 1997).

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at each of the following locations:

Trade Zone Services Corporation, 600 West Service Road, Suite 307A, Washington Dulles International Airport, Washington, DC 20041  
Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 3716, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230

Dated: May 13, 1997.

**John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,**

*Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-13664 Filed 5-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 887]

#### Expansion of Foreign-Trade Zone 20 Hampton Roads, Virginia, 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*, an application from the Virginia Port Authority, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 20, for authority to expand Foreign-Trade Zone 20 to include ten additional sites in the Hampton Roads and Front Royal, Virginia, areas, was filed by the Board on April 15, 1996 (FTZ Docket 30-96, 61 FR 18380, 4/25/97); and,

*Whereas*, notice inviting public comment was given in **Federal Register** 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 20 is approved, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28, and subject to the standard 2,000-acre activation limit.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 8th day of May 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

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

[FR Doc. 97-13667 Filed 5-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-549-813]

#### Notice of Court Decision: Canned Pineapple Fruit From Thailand

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

**SUMMARY:** On March 18, 1997, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the Department of Commerce's results of redetermination pursuant to remand of the final determination of sales at less than fair value in the investigation of canned pineapple fruit from Thailand. *Thai Public Pineapple Co. v. United States*, Slip Op. 97-32.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 23, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Gabriel Adler at (202) 482-1442 or Kris Campbell at (202) 482-3813, Office of Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On June 5, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its final affirmative antidumping determination (final determination) in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation of canned pineapple fruit from Thailand. 60 FR 36775. On July 18, 1995, the Department published an amended final determination and antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit from Thailand. 60 FR 36775. In the final determination, for three Thai respondents, the Department used the pineapple fruit cost allocations from each company's normal accounting system because each company's allocation methodology was consistent with Thai generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP") and reasonably reflected the actual production costs incurred during the period of investigation. For the fourth respondent, Dole, the Department relied upon an average of the fruit cost allocation percentages normally used by the other three because, although Dole's

allocation methodology was consistent with Thai GAAP, it did not reasonably reflect the costs associated with production of canned pineapple fruit ("CPF"). The Department did not use the alternative fruit cost methodologies submitted by respondents, which were based on the relative weight of fresh pineapple fruit in CPF and other products.

The respondents sued, arguing, *inter alia*, that the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit's (CAFC) decision in *IPSCO, Inc. v. United States*, 965 F.2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1992) ("*IPSCO*"), mandates the use of a weight-based cost allocation methodology.

On November 8, 1996, the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) remanded the case to the Department with instructions either to accept the weight-based methodologies for allocation of costs submitted by the respondents, or to rely on another "non-output price-based cost allocation methodology." Slip Op. 96-182. The CIT held that the Department's reliance on the allocations of costs in the respondents' normal accounting systems was "arbitrary, capricious, not based on substantial evidence and contrary to law" because, according to the CIT, these allocations were "unreliable and distortive of actual costs." *Id.* at 19. The CIT then held that the CAFC in *IPSCO* had held that only a weight-based allocation of costs is permitted under the antidumping statute. *Id.* at 28-29.

On February 4, 1997, the Department filed its remand with the CIT. In the remand, the Department stated that although it respectfully disagreed with the CIT's decision, it had nonetheless complied with the CIT's instructions and had revised its determination to reflect the weight-based fruit cost allocation methodologies submitted by the respondents. On March 18, 1997, the CIT affirmed the Department's remand determination. Slip. Op. 97-32.

We note that in its decision in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990), the CAFC held that, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. § 1516a(e), the Department must publish notice of a court decision which is not "in harmony" with a Department determination, and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a "conclusive" court decision. The CIT opinions in *Thai Public Pineapple Co. v. United States* on November 8, 1996, and March 18, 1997, constitute a decision not in harmony with the Department's final determination. Publication of this notice fulfills the "*Timken*" requirement.

Absent an appeal, or, if appealed, upon a "conclusive" court decision affirming the CIT's opinion, the