

## II. Method of Collection

Prior to receiving the 2004 questionnaire, each housing unit included in the test will be mailed an advance letter informing respondents that they will soon receive a census form. A few days after the questionnaire packages are delivered, each household will receive a reminder postcard that asks respondents to fill out and return their questionnaires, if they have not already done so. The postcard also will thank respondents who have already returned their forms.

Census Day is scheduled for April 1, 2004. About 10 days after that date, each household in the mailout/mailback universe that did not return the initial form will receive a replacement questionnaire. After respondents have had a chance to complete and return their forms, enumerators will visit each housing unit that has not responded (NRFU). NRFU is scheduled to begin approximately three weeks after Census Day. Enumerators will use handheld MCDs rather than paper questionnaires for data collection during NRFU.

Although the 2004 mailback form is similar to the Census 2000 short form in both content and format, there are several significant differences. These include revised wording for residence rules instructions; the addition of two coverage questions; a revised race question that eliminates the "Some other race" option; revisions in wording in the Hispanic origin question; and a format that allows a respondent to record information for up to 12 household members.

Completing the paper questionnaire and responding to the questions again during the telephone section of the Race and Hispanic/Latino Response Evaluation will take approximately 10 minutes. Preliminary research indicates enumerator-filled forms (data collected using MCDs during NRFU) also will take about 10 minutes. All data capture operations will be conducted at the Census Bureau's National Processing Center (NPC) located in Jeffersonville, Indiana.

In order to conduct the 2004 Census Test, we hope to create content and wording that will allow data collection using the MCDs to be comparable to other modes of response. The Census Bureau is designing software for handheld devices that is intended to incorporate both Spanish and English language capabilities and that will result in MCDs that will be easy for enumerators to use.

The goal of the two-part Race and Hispanic/Latino Response Evaluation is to understand how changes to the Race

and Hispanic origin questions affect response behavior. The evaluation will study missing data rates, NRFU response distributions, and behavior coding data gathered in the process of conducting some NRFU interviews.

The Behavior Coding section of the test will involve taping and coding the behavior of about 2,000 enumerators and respondents during the NRFU personal visit interviews in the Queens, NY site. An ETA who accompanies each enumerator will record the selected interviews using a handheld recorder. ETAs will be trained to use basic interviewing techniques, operate the recorder, and take notes on respondent and interviewer behavior during the interview. Behavior coding is intended to provide data about respondents' verbal reaction to the race and Hispanic origin question as well as information about interviewer behavior while asking these questions. These interviews will be conducted and voice-recorded with the respondent's permission.

The second section of the Race and Hispanic/Latino Response Evaluation—Re-interview Follow-up—also is restricted to the Queens, NY site. The 2004 Census Test questionnaire will be administered to selected respondents after the NRFU visit. We will re-administer the 2004 Census Test questionnaire by telephone in order to evaluate the response distribution of the race question. The resulting response distribution is intended to provide information for evaluating the effect of changes in the race and Hispanic origin questions and response categories, as well as dropping the "Some other race" option.

Employees from the NPC will contact a sample of approximately 2,800 households to re-administer the 2004 questionnaire beginning in June 2004. Data gathered as a result of these interviews will be processed at NPC. The goal for this segment of the Race and Hispanic/Latino Response Evaluation is 2,000 completed interviews.

### Definition of Terms

**Residence Rules**—Rules that respondents and the Census Bureau use to determine where people should be counted. They are meant to insure that everyone is counted once and in the right place for the primary purposes of apportionment.

**Nonresponse Followup (NRFU)**—An operation developed to obtain completed questionnaires from housing units for which the Census Bureau did not receive a completed questionnaire in mail census areas (mailout/mailback, update/leave, and urban update/leave).

Enumerators visit addresses to collect the information.

## III. Data

*OMB Control Number:* None.

*Form Number(s):* DB-1 (2004 Census Test).

*Type of Review:* Regular.

*Affected Public:* Individuals and households.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* Approximately 200,000 households for the 2004 Census Test. Approximately 2,800 households for Race and Hispanic/Latino Response Evaluation.

*Estimated Time Per Response:* 10 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 33,800.

*Estimated Total Annual Cost:* There is no cost to respondents except for their time to respond.

*Respondent Obligation:* Mandatory.

**Legal Authority:** Title 13 of the United States Code, sections 141 and 193.

## IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection; (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, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

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

Dated: July 7, 2003.

**Gwellnar Banks,**

*Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 03-17545 Filed 7-10-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-07-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****International Trade Administration****[A-122-822]****Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Canada: Rescission, in Part, of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review****AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a timely request from petitioners, Bethlehem Steel Corp., National Steel Corp., and United States Steel Corp., the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of Stelco Inc. (Stelco) and Dofasco Inc. (Dofasco) under the antidumping duty order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products (CORE) from Canada covering the period August 1, 2001 through July 31, 2002. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, Requests for Revocation in Part and Deferral of Administrative Reviews*, 67 FR 60210 (September 25, 2002). Petitioners, which were the only parties to request this review, have now withdrawn their request for an administrative review with respect to Stelco. Accordingly, the Department is rescinding, in part, its review of CORE for Stelco in accordance with section 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 11, 2003.**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Christian Hughes or Elfi Blum-Page, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-0190 or (202) 482-0197, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Background**

The Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on CORE from Canada on August 19, 1993. *See Antidumping Duty Orders: Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Canada*, 58 FR 44162 (August 19, 1993). On August 6, 2002, the Department published an opportunity to request administrative review. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative*

*Review*, 67 FR 50856 (August 6, 2002). On August 30, 2002, the Department received a timely request from petitioners to conduct an administrative review pursuant to section 351.213(b) of the Department's regulations. On September 25, 2002, the Department initiated the administrative review covering the period August 1, 2001 to July 31, 2002, for producers Stelco and Dofasco. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, Requests for Revocation in Part and Deferral of Administrative Reviews*, 67 FR 60210 (September 25, 2002). On April 24, 2003, petitioners withdrew their review request for this period with respect to Stelco in accordance with section 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations. On May 1, 2003, Stelco filed comments in opposition to petitioners' withdrawal request, and requested the Department to continue the review.

**Rescission, in Part, of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of CORE**

The Department is rescinding the antidumping duty administrative review of Stelco, covering the period August 1, 2001 through July 31, 2002, in accordance with section 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations. Although petitioners' withdrawal request for this review was not within the normal time limit as prescribed in section 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations, we find that, under the circumstances of this review, it is appropriate to accept the withdrawal request and rescind the review with respect to Stelco. According to section 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations, the Department will rescind an administrative review "if a party that requested the review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review." The regulations further provide that the Secretary "may extend this time limit if the Secretary decides that it is reasonable to do so." In this case, petitioners' withdrawal request was not within the 90-day time limit. However, the Department has determined that rescinding the review is appropriate. Continuing this review would only require Stelco, the domestic industry and the Department to expend time and resources on a review in which the only parties that requested the review are no longer interested. The Department has not released supplemental questionnaires with respect to Stelco, nor conducted verification. Therefore, the Department does not believe the administrative review has proceeded to a point at which it would be "unreasonable" to

rescind the review. Furthermore, there are no overarching policy issues which would warrant continuing with this review.

The Department, therefore, has determined that it is reasonable to extend the 90-day time limit and to rescind, in part, the administrative review of CORE for the period August 1, 2001 through July 31, 2002 with respect to Stelco. (For a full discussion of the comments filed with respect to whether to rescind this review, *see Memorandum to the File from Christian Hughes, Analyst, Re: Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Canada: 08/01/01- 07/31/02; Rescission, in Part, of the Ninth Administrative Review with Respect to Stelco, Inc.*, July 3, 2003.) The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to the U.S. Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (BCBP) within 15 days of publication of this notice. The Department will direct the BCBP to assess antidumping duties for this company at the cash deposit rate in effect on the date of entry for entries during the period August 1, 2001 through July 31, 2002.

**Notification to Parties**

This notice serves as a reminder to importers of their responsibility under section 351.402(f) of the Department's regulations to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this period of time. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with section 351.305(a)(3) of the Department's regulations. Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This determination and notice are issued and published in accordance with sections 351.213(d)(4) and sections 751(a)(2)(c) and 777(I)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: July 3, 2003.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Grant Aldonas,  
Under Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 03-17626 Filed 7-10-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-533-813]

#### Certain Preserved Mushrooms From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On March 7, 2003, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the third administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India. The review covers three manufacturers/exporters. The period of review is February 1, 2001, through January 31, 2002.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of Review."

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 11, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

David J. Goldberger or Katherine Johnson, Office 2, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Import Administration—Room B099, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4136 or (202) 482-4929, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### Background

The review covers three manufacturers/exporters: Agro Dutch Foods Ltd. ("Agro Dutch"), Himalya International Ltd. ("Himalya"), and Weikfield Agro Products Ltd. ("Weikfield"). The period of review is February 1, 2001, through January 31, 2002.

On March 7, 2003, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the third administrative

review of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India (68 FR 11045). We invited parties to comment on the preliminary results of review. On April 7, 2003, we received a request for a public hearing from respondent Weikfield. We received case briefs from the petitioner,<sup>1</sup> Agro Dutch, and Weikfield on May 2, 2003. We received rebuttal briefs from the petitioner and Weikfield on May 13, 2003. On June 3, 2003, Weikfield withdrew its request for a public hearing. We have conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act").

#### Scope of the Order

The products covered by the order are certain preserved mushrooms, whether imported whole, sliced, diced, or as stems and pieces. The preserved mushrooms covered under the order are the species *Agaricus bisporus* and *Agaricus bitorquis*. "Preserved mushrooms" refer to mushrooms that have been prepared or preserved by cleaning, blanching, and sometimes slicing or cutting. These mushrooms are then packed and heated in containers including but not limited to cans or glass jars in a suitable liquid medium, including but not limited to water, brine, butter or butter sauce. Preserved mushrooms may be imported whole, sliced, diced, or as stems and pieces. Included within the scope of the order are "brined" mushrooms, which are presalted and packed in a heavy salt solution to provisionally preserve them for further processing.

Excluded from the scope of the order are the following: (1) All other species of mushroom, including straw mushrooms; (2) all fresh and chilled mushrooms, including "refrigerated" or "quick blanched mushrooms"; (3) dried mushrooms; (4) frozen mushrooms; and (5) "marinated," "acidified" or "pickled" mushrooms, which are prepared or preserved by means of vinegar or acetic acid, but may contain oil or other additives.

The merchandise subject to the order is classifiable under subheadings 2003.10.0127, 2003.10.0131, 2003.10.0137, 2003.10.0143, 2003.10.0147, 2003.10.0153, and 0711.51.0000 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States*

<sup>1</sup> The petitioner is the Coalition for Fair Preserved Mushroom Trade which includes the American Mushroom Institute and the following domestic companies: L.K. Bowman, Inc.; Modern Mushroom Farms, Inc.; Monterey Mushrooms, Inc.; Mount Laurel Canning Corp.; Mushrooms Canning Company; Southwood Farms; Sunny Dell Foods, Inc.; and United Canning Corp.

("HTSUS")<sup>2</sup>. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

#### Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this antidumping duty administrative review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" ("Decision Memo") from Jeffrey May, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to Joseph A. Spetrini, Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated July 7, 2003, which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues which parties have raised and to which we have responded, all of which are in the Decision Memo, is attached to this notice as an Appendix. 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 Department building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

#### Changes From the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of comments received, we have made certain changes to the margin calculations, including:

- We revised the calculation for Weikfield's indirect selling expenses to exclude the amounts for commissions and discounts Weikfield and its affiliate paid to unaffiliated parties.
- We revised Weikfield's U.S. indirect selling expenses used as an offset to home market commissions to include inventory carrying expenses.
- We excluded a deduction from Weikfield's home market price for "Discount Program 2."
- We did not make a deduction for the Indian export tax to the price of one of Weikfield's U.S. sales.
- We revised Weikfield's reported general and administrative (G&A) expenses to include idle depreciation costs experienced during the POR.
- We revised Weikfield's reported financial expenses to exclude long-term financial and non-financial income. In addition, we included all financial expenses incurred during the POR, including certain expenses associated with debt restructuring. Finally, we

<sup>2</sup> Prior to January 1, 2002, the HTSUS numbers were as follows: 2003.10.0027, 2003.10.0031, 2003.10.0037, 2003.10.0043, 2003.10.0047, 2003.10.0053, and 0711.90.4000.