agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, *e.g.*, the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: December 6, 2002.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 02–31263 Filed 12–11–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–BV–P

### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for emergency clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Agency: National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

*Title:* Survey of Occupants, First Responders, and Families of Victims of World Trade Center 1, 2, and 7.

Form Number(s): None.

*OMB Approval Number:* None. *Type of Request:* Emergency.

Burden Hours: 3,100.

Number of Respondents: 2,300. Average Hours Per Response: 1 hour for the questionnaire; and 2 hours for interview participation.

Needs and Uses: NIST will be conducting the Investigation as requested under the WTC Report issued by Congress on February 8, 2002. The objectives of the NIST World Trade Center Investigation are to: (1) Determine technically, why and how the buildings, WTC 1, 2, and 7, collapsed following the initial impact of the aircraft; (2) determine why the injuries and fatalities were so high or low depending on location, including all technical aspects of fire protection, response, evacuation, and occupant behavior and emergency response; (3) determine the procedures and practices that were used in the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the World Trade Center Buildings; and (4) identify, as

specifically as possible, building and fire codes, standards, and practices that warrant revision and are still in use. The proposed information collection will consist of questionnaire and interview segments. This information will be used to develop or refute investigatory hypotheses, support modeling results, and record events inside the buildings which cannot otherwise be determined. This information must be conducted in a timely manner in order to facilitate dissemination to other aspects of the Investigation, including structural analysis, emergency personnel response, thermal environment and interior tenability, and egress and human behavior analysis.

*Affected Public:* Individuals and households (present at the World Trade Center Complex on the morning of September 11, 2001).

*Frequency:* One-time. *Respondent Obligation:* Voluntary. *OMB Desk Officer:* David Rostker, (202) 395–3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, (202) 482–0266, Department of Commerce, Room 66625, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at *dHynek@doc.gov*).

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent by December 20, 2002 to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: December 6, 2002.

#### Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 02–31264 Filed 12–11–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–13–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### Foreign-Trade Zones Board

## [A(27F)-48-02]

#### Foreign-Trade Zone 15—Kansas City, MO Redesignation of Foreign-Trade Subzone 15D

Based on a request by the Greater Kansas City Foreign-Trade Zone, Inc., grantee of FTZ 15, for a minor modification of the grant of authority for FTZ Subzone 15D at the Bayer Corporation facilities (Board Order 440, 54 FR 38413, 9/18/89, as expanded by Board Order 1061, 64 FR 63786, 11/22/ 99), Subzone 15D, Sites 2 and 3, are designated as Subzone 17B. Subzone 15D, comprised of only Site 1, will be operated by Bayer Corporation's Bayer CropScience group. New Subzone 17B, comprised of Sites 2 and 3 from SZ 15D, will be operated by Bayer Corporation's Bayer Health Care group. The authority for the sites, now designated as Subzone 17B, will continue to be based on the FTZ Board's authorization in Board Order 440 and 1061.

Dated: December 4, 2002.

## Dennis Puccinelli,

Executive Secretary. [FR Doc. 02–31377 Filed 12–11–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[A(27F)-50-02]

## Foreign-Trade Zone 122—Corpus Christi, TX Redesignation of Foreign-Trade Subzone 122A

Based on a request by the Port of Corpus Christi Authority, grantee of FTZ 122, for a minor modification of the grant of authority for FTZ Subzone 122A, at the former Coastal refinery, in Nueces County, Texas, Subzone 122A is redesignated as Site 2 and Site 3 of Subzone 122J, Valero Refining Company (Valero). Valero has leased the refinery from Coastal and will operate the facilities under one subzone operating system. The authority for both subzones has most recently been amended by Board Order 1116 (65 FR 52696, 8/30/ 00), and the authority for Subzone 122J will continue to be based on the authority in Board Order 1116, including its conditions and restrictions.

Dated: December 4, 2002.

## Dennis Puccinelli, Executive Secretary. [FR Doc. 02–31378 Filed 12–11–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

# DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

# International Trade Administration

[A-337-803]

## Fresh Atlantic Salmon From Chile: Notice of Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**SUMMARY:** In response to requests by certain producers/exporters of subject

merchandise and by L.R. Enterprises, Inc., a domestic producer of subject merchandise, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on fresh Atlantic salmon from Chile for the period of review July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002. We are now rescinding this review with respect to 72 companies for which L.R. Enterprises, Inc., withdrew its request for an administrative review.

# EFFECTIVE DATE: December 12, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Constance Handley or Carol Henninger, at (202) 482–0631 or (202) 482–3003, respectively; AD/CVD Enforcement, Office V, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### **Applicable Statute and Regulations**

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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (2002).

#### Background

On July 1, 2002, the Department issued a notice of opportunity to request the fourth administrative review of this order. See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review, 67 FR 44172 (July 1, 2002). On July 31, 2002, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), L.R. Enterprises, Inc., requested a review of 90 producers/ exporters of fresh Atlantic salmon. Also, on July 31, 2002, Cultivos Marinos Chiloe Ltda. (Cultivos Marinos), Pesquera Eicosal Ltda. (Eicosal), Cultivadora de Salmones Linao Ltda. (Linao), Salmones Tecmar S.A. (Tecmar), Fiordo Blanco S.A. (Fiordo Blanco), Salmones Friosur S.A. (Friosur), Salmones Mainstream S.A. (Mainstream), Marine Harvest Chile S.A. (Marine Harvest), Salmones Multiexport Ltda. (Multiexport), Salmones Pacifico Sur S.A. (Pacifico Sur), Pesca Chile S.A. (Pesca Chile), and Salmones Pacific Star Ltda. (Pacific Star) each requested its own review. L.R. Enterprises had requested a review of each of these companies.

On August 27, 2002, the Department published the notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review, covering the period July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002. See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part, 67 FR 55000 (August 27, 2002).

On September 5, 2002, L. R. Enterprises, Inc., withdrew its review request for all companies except: (1) Asesoria Acuicola S.A.; (2) Best Salmon/Skyring Salmon S.A.; (3) Cultivos Marinos; (4) Cultivos Yadran S.A.; (5) Eicosal; (6) Friosur/Pesquera Friosur; (7) Invertec Pesquera Mar de Chiloe Ltda. (Invertec); (8) Linao/ Salmoamerica; (9) Mainstream; (10) Marine Harvest; (11) Multiexport; (12) Ocean Horizons; (13) Pacific Star; (14) Pacifico Sur/Aquachile S.A.; (15) Pesca Chile; (16) Pesquera Los Fiordos Ltda. (Los Fiordos); (17) Robinson Crusoe Y Cia. Ltda. (Robinson Crusoe); and (18) Tecmar/Fjord Seafood Chile.

Subsequently, on September 25, October 18, 22, and November 25, 2002, L.R. Enterprises, Inc., withdrew its request that the Department conduct an administrative review of Pacific Star, Robinson Crusoe, Asesoria Acuicola S.A., Marine Harvest, and Los Fiordos respectively. Fiordo Blanco, Pacific Star, and Marine Harvest, which had each requested its own review on July 31, 2002, subsequently withdrew their requests on September 6, 27, and October 24, 2002, respectively.

#### Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

By its letters of September 5, 25, October 18, 22, and November 25, 2002, L.R. Enterprises, Inc., withdrew its request for an administrative review of the following companies: Acuicultura de Aquas Australes Agromar Ltda. Aguas Claras S.A. Antarfish S.A. Aquasur Fisheries Ltda. Asesoria Acuicola S.A. Australis S.A. Cenculmavique Centro de Cultivo de Moluscos Cerro Farrellon Ltda. Chile Cultivos S.A. Chisal S.A. Comercializadora Smoltech Ltda. Complejo Piscicola Coyhaique Cultivos San Iuan Empresa Nichiro Chile Ltda. Fiordo Blanco S.A. **Fisher Farms** Fitz Rov S.A. Friosur S.A. Ganadera Del Mar Gentec S.A.

Granja Maria Torna Galeones S.A. Hiuto Salmones S.A. Huitosal Mares Australes Salmo Pac. Instituto Tecnologico Del Salmon S.A. Inversiones Pacific Star Ltda. Los Fiordos Ltda. Manao Bay Fishery S.A. Mardim Ltda. Marine Harvest Chile S.A. Pacific Mariculture Patagonia Fish Farming S.A. Patagonia Salmon Farming S.A. Pesquera Antares S.A. Pesquera Chiloe S.A. Pesquera Los Fiordos Ltda. Pesquera Mares de Chile S.A. Pesquera Pacific Star Pesquera Quellon Ltda. Pesquera Y Comercial Rio Peulla S.A. Piscicola Entre Rios S.A. Piscicultura Iculpe Piscicultura La Cascada Piscultura Santa Margarita Productos Del Mar Ventisqueros S.A. Prosmolt S.A. Quetro S.A. River Salmon S.A. Robinson Crusoe Y Cia. Ltda. Salmones Andes S.A. Salmones Antarctica S.A. Salmones Aucar Ltda. Salmones Caicaen S.A. Salmones Calbuco S.A. Salmones Chiloe S.A. Salmones Huillinco S.A. Salmones Ice Val Ltda. Salmones Llanguihue Salmones Pacific Star Ltda. Salmones Quellon Salmones Ranco Sur Ltda. Salmones Tierra Del Fuego Ltda. Salmones Unimarc S.A. Salmosan Seafine Salmon S.A. Soc. Agricola Chillehue Ltda. Soc. Alimentos Maritimos Avalon Ltda. Soc. Aquacultivos Ltda. Truchas Aguas Blancas Ltda. Trusal S.A. Ventisqueros S.A.

We note that L.R. Enterprises originally requested a review of Salmones Friosur, Pesquera Friosur and Friosur S.A. On September 5, 2002, when L.R. Enterprises withdrew its request for review of a number of companies, "Salmones Friosur" was on the list of companies which L.R. Enterprises wished to remain in the review. We are rescinding the review with respect to Friosur S.A. Salmones Friosur and its affiliate Pesquera Friosur continue to be covered by this review. Information on the record indicates that neither Salmones Friosur nor Pesquera Friosur produce subject merchandise under the name Friosur S.A.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 315.213(d)(1), we are rescinding the administrative review

with respect to each of the above listed companies. With the exception of Marine Harvest, which is currently involved in litigation,<sup>1</sup> the Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions to the U.S. Customs Service within 15 days of publication of this notice.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 751 of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: December 6, 2002.

#### Bernard T. Carreau,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02–31376 Filed 12–11–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## International Trade Administration

# [A-549-812]

## Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Furfuryl Alcohol from Thailand

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

SUMMARY: On August 7, 2002, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on furfuryl alcohol from Thailand. This review covers one producer/exporter of the subject merchandise, Indorama Chemicals (Thailand) Limited (Indorama). The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2000, through June 30, 2001. Based on comments received, including the identification of certain ministerial errors, we have made changes in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margin is listed below in the section entitled Final Results of Review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 12, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tisha Loeper-Viti 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) 482–7425 or (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 the Department regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (2001).

#### Background

On August 7, 2002, the Department published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on furfuryl alcohol from Thailand. See Furfuryl Alcohol from Thailand: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 67 FR 51191 (Aug. 7, 2002). In response to the Department's invitation to comment on the preliminary results of this review, Indorama submitted comments on September 6, 2002. No other comments were submitted, nor was a hearing requested.

#### **Scope of Review**

The merchandise covered by this review is furfuryl alcohol (C4H3OCH2OH). Furfuryl alcohol is a primary alcohol, and is colorless or pale yellow in appearance. It is used in the manufacture of resins and as a wetting agent and solvent for coating resins, nitrocellulose, cellulose acetate, and other soluble dyes.

The product subject to this order is classifiable under subheading 2932.13.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

#### Analysis of Comment Received

The sole issue raised in Indorama's case brief is addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Furfuryl Alcohol from Thailand, from Bernard T. Carreau, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Group II, Import Administration, to Farvar Shirzad, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated December 5, 2002, (Decision Memorandum) which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issue raised pertains to alleged sales outside the ordinary course of trade and not sold in usual commercial quantities. Parties can find a complete discussion of this issue and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the

Central Records Unit, room B-099 of the main Commerce 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.

# **Final Results of Review**

As a result of our review, we determine that the following weightedaverage percentage margin exists for the period July 1, 2000, through June 30, 2001:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Indorama Chemicals (Thailand) Ltd. (Indorama)	0.43

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 importer-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. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to the Customs Service within 15 days of publication of these final results of review.

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 Indorama, because the margin is *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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>See Marine Harvest (Chile) S.A. v. United States, Court No. 01–00808, November 21, 2002.