

Petitioners did not comment on this issue.

Department's Position: We agree with Dofasco and have made the appropriate corrections to the programming language in the margin calculation program.

Comment 8: A more fundamental error exists in the Department's recalculation of credit expenses.

Dofasco alleges that the Department made a more fundamental error in the calculation of its U.S. credit expenses. Dofasco contends that the Department must correct the methodology it used to recalculate these expenses.

Petitioners, however, argue that the comment submitted by Dofasco is unrelated to any ministerial error comments contained in petitioners' March 6, 2000 submission, and as such, does not constitute a reply pursuant to section 351.224(c)(3) of the Department's regulations. Instead, petitioners contend that this is simply an untimely submission of a new ministerial error comment pursuant to section 351.224(c)(1) of the Department's regulations and should not be considered by the Department.

Department's Position: We agree with petitioners that Dofasco's claim is not a rebuttal comment, but instead, an untimely submission of a new ministerial error comment. Therefore, in accordance with section 351.224(d) of the Department's regulations, we have not considered this allegation for these amended final results.

As a result of the corrections made to the arm's length, model match, and margin calculation programs, the margin for corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Canada for Dofasco has changed from 0.16 percent to 0.20 percent.

Stelco

On February 28, 2000, petitioners alleged that the Department made ministerial errors in calculating the final antidumping duty margin with respect to Stelco, one of the respondents in the review of corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Canada. Petitioners alleged that the Department made certain errors in its computer programming language for the model match and margin calculation programs, when implementing its adjustment to G&A for Baycoat G&A expenses in the cost of production (COP) and constructed value (CV) calculations. Petitioners argue that the Department should have renamed the G&A variable when making the Baycoat adjustment, to avoid distortion of the value of Stelco's G&A.

We agree with petitioners that we incorrectly calculated the revised G&A expenses for Stelco by not renaming the G&A variable in our COP and CV calculations after adjusting for Baycoat's G&A expenses. We have made the pertinent corrections in the programming language of our model match and margin calculation programs, and renamed the respective variables to RGNA and RGNACV.

As a result of these corrections, the margin for corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Canada for Stelco has changed from 0.68 percent to 4.24 percent.

Amended Final Results of Review

Upon review of the submitted allegations, the Department has determined that the following margins exist for the period August 1, 1997, through July 31, 1998:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Corrosion Resistant Steel:	
CCC	1.01
Dofasco	0.20
National	5.65
Stelco	4.24
Cut-to-Length Plate:	
MRM	0.00
Stelco	0.00

The Department will determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. For assessment purposes, we have calculated importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rates for the merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total quantity of sales examined. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these amended final results for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for each reviewed company will be the rates stated above (except that no deposit will be required for firms with zero or *de minimis* margins, *i.e.*, margins less than 0.5 percent); (2) for exporters not covered in this review, but covered in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a previous review, or the

original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the "all others" rates established in the LTFV investigations, which were 18.71 percent for corrosion-resistant steel products and 61.88 percent for plate (see *Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value and Anti-Dumping Orders: Certain Corrosion Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Canada*, 60 FR 49582 (September 26, 1995)). These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative reviews.

These administrative reviews and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1) and 19 CFR 351.213 and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5)).

Dated: March 30, 2000.

Robert S. LaRussa,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-8699 Filed 4-6-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-122-823]

Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Canada; Preliminary Results of Full Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of full sunset review: Cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada.

SUMMARY: On September 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada (64 FR 47767) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and an adequate substantive response filed on behalf of domestic interested parties and inadequate response from respondent interested parties (in this case, because exports of the respondent account for less than the threshold amount of exports (*i.e.* 50 percent)), the Department determined to conduct an

expedited review. However, upon reconsideration of initial adequacy determination, the Department determines that it is appropriate in this case to conduct a full review. As a result of this review, the Department preliminarily finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Preliminary Results of Review section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 7, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathryn B. McCormick or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1930 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to 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 citations to the Department regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1999). Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98.3—*Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*; Policy Bulletin, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("Sunset Policy Bulletin").

Background

On September 1, 1999, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada (64 FR 47767), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received a notice of intent to participate on behalf of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation and U.S. Steel Corporation, a unit of USX Corporation ("domestic interested parties"), within the applicable deadline (September 15, 1999) specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations*. On October 1, 1999, Stelco Inc. ("Stelco") notified the Department of its intent to participate in this review as a respondent interested party. Domestic interested parties claimed interested-party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as U.S. producers of a domestic like product; Stelco is an

interested party pursuant to section 771(9)(A) of the Act, as a foreign producer and exporter of subject merchandise.

On September 24, 1999, we received a request for an extension to file rebuttal comments from domestic interested parties.¹ Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.302(b), the Department extended the deadline for all participants eligible to file rebuttal comments until October 15, 1999.² On October 1, 1999, we received a complete substantive response from domestic interested parties, within the 30-day deadline specified in the *Sunset Regulations* under section 351.218(d)(3)(i), and a complete substantive response from Stelco. On October 15, 1999, we received rebuttal comments from domestic and respondent interested parties. On October 20, 1999, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(A), the Department determined to conduct an expedited (120-day) sunset review of this order.³

Domestic interested parties and Stelco claim that they have been involved in this proceeding since its inception. Domestic interested parties state that they have participated in the investigation, all five administrative reviews, and all related appeals (see October 1, 1999, Substantive Response of domestic interested parties at 4). Likewise, Stelco states that it was a respondent party in the original investigation, and has participated in each subsequent administrative review (see October 1, 1999, Substantive Response of Stelco at 3).

On November 10, 1999, we received comments from the Government of Canada and Stelco on the adequacy and appropriateness of an expedited sunset review concerning the subject order. Based on the comments we've received from Stelco, we have now determined that it is appropriate to conduct a full review in this case.

In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, the Department may treat a review as extraordinarily complicated if it is a review of a transition order (*i.e.*, an

order in effect on January 1, 1995). This review concerns a transition order within the meaning of section 751(c)(6)(ii) of the Act. Accordingly, on December 22, 1999, the Department determined that the sunset review of cut-to-length carbon steel flat plate is extraordinarily complicated, and extended the time limit for completion of the final results of this review until not later than March 29, 2000, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.⁴

Scope of Review

These products include hot-rolled carbon steel universal mill plates (*i.e.*, flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 millimeters but not exceeding 1,250 millimeters and of a thickness of not less than 4 millimeters, not in coils and without patterns in relief), of rectangular shape, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances; and certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat-rolled products in straight lengths, of rectangular shape, hot rolled, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, 4.75 millimeters or more in thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule ("HTS") under item numbers: 7208.40.3030, 7208.40.3060, 7208.51.5030, 7208.51.0045, 7208.51.0060, 7208.52.0000, 7208.53.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.13.0000, 7211.14.0030, 7211.14.0045, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, and 7212.50.0000.

Included in this order are flat-rolled products of non-rectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been "worked after rolling")—for example, products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges.

Excluded from this order is grade X-70 plate. Also excluded is cut-to-length carbon steel plate meeting the following criteria: (1) 100 percent dry steel plates, virgin steel, no scrap content (free of Cobalt-60 and other radioactive nuclides); (2) 0.290 inches maximum thickness, plus 0.0, minus 0.030 inches;

¹ See September 24, 1999, Request for an Extension to File Rebuttal Comments in the Sunset Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders: A-602-803; A-351-817; C-351-818, A-122-822, A-122-823, A-405-802, A-588-826, A-421-804, A-455-802, A-485-803, C-401-401, C-401-804, C-401-805, from Valerie S. Schindler, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP, to Jeffrey A. May, Office of Policy.

² See September 30, 1999, Letter from Jeffrey A. May, Director, Office of Policy to Valerie S. Schindler, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP.

³ See October 20, 1999, Memorandum for Jeffrey A. May, Re: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Flat Plate from Canada: Adequacy of Respondent Interested Party Response to the Notice of Initiation.

⁴ See *Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Expedited Five-Year Reviews*, 64 FR 71726 (December 22, 1999).

(3) 48.00 inch wide, plus 0.05, minus 0.0 inches; (4) 10 foot lengths, plus 0.5, minus 0.0 inches; (5) flatness, plus/minus 0.5 inch over 10 feet; (6) AISI 1006; (7) tension leveled; (8) pickled and oiled; and (9) carbon content, 0.3 to 0.8 (maximum). On February 28, 1996, the Department revoked the order with respect to certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate free of cobalt-60 and other radioactive nuclides; and with certain dimensions and other characteristics.⁵ On February 12, 1999, the Department revoked the order with respect to certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate free of cobalt-60 and other radioactive nuclides; and with certain dimensions and other characteristics.⁶ In addition, there has been one circumvention inquiry initiated with respect to imports of boron-added grader blade and draft key steel.⁷ These HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this sunset review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" ("Decision Memo") from Jeffrey A. May, Director, Office of Policy, Import Administration, to Robert S. La Russa, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated March 29, 2000, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the attached Decision Memo include adequacy, the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping, and the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail were the order revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review 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 Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at www.ita.doc.gov/import_admin/records/frn. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

⁵ See *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Canada: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order*, 61 FR 7471 (February 28, 1996).

⁶ See *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Canada: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order*, 64 FR 7167 (February 12, 1999).

⁷ See *Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Canada; Initiation of Anticircumvention Inquiry on Antidumping Duty Order*, 63 FR 29179 (May 28, 1998).

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margins:

Manufacturer/exporters	Margin (percent)
Stelco, Inc	68.70
All Others	61.88

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held on May 17, 2000, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than May 8, 2000, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i). Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than May 15, 2000. The Department will issue a notice of final results of this sunset review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, no later than July 27, 2000, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.

This five-year ("sunset") review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 29, 2000.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-8689 Filed 4-6-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-423-805]

Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Belgium; Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of expedited sunset review: Cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Belgium.

SUMMARY: On September 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Belgium (64 FR 47767) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of

a notice of intent to participate and an adequate substantive response filed on behalf of domestic interested parties and inadequate response from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 7, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathryn B. McCormick or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1930 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to 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 citations to the Department regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1999). Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98.3—*Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("*Sunset Policy Bulletin*").

Background

On September 1, 1999, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Belgium (64 FR 47767), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received a notice of intent to participate on behalf of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation and U.S. Steel Corporation, a unit of USX Corporation ("domestic interested parties"), within the applicable deadline (September 15, 1999) specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations*. Domestic interested parties claimed interested-party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as U.S. producers of a domestic like product.

On September 20, 1999, we received a request for an extension to file rebuttal comments from domestic interested