

these expedited review proceedings, we have sent several questionnaires to Fraser Pacific, Frontier Mills, and Landmark to clarify the data that was submitted. We have calculated the rate for this company using our cross-owned methodology as described above in the methodology section of this notice. Thus, we have accounted for not only its cross-ownership with Landmark, but also its cross-ownership with Frontier Mills.

Comment 4: Power Wood Corporation (Power Wood) and Rielly Industrial Lumber Inc. (Rielly). Petitioners assert that the total sales of subject merchandise reported in Power Wood's and Rielly's exclusion request differs from the amount reported in the expedited review process. Moreover, petitioners contend that in the company exclusion process these two companies certified that they received no benefit from provincial Crown stumpage in British Columbia. Yet, petitioners point out that in the Power Wood's and Rielly's expedited review application, they reported that they acquired Crown-origin logs from British Columbia during the POR.

Department's Position: As noted in Comment 2 above concerning Central Cedar, these expedited review proceedings are different from the exclusion process. We have provided in these expedited reviews specific instructions how to derive the data for sales. In addition, we have taken into account Power Wood's and Rielly's Crown-origin logs reported in the company's questionnaire response in our calculation for this company's individual cash deposit rate.

Comment 5: Sylvanex Lumber Products Inc. Petitioners argue that in the company exclusion proceeding, Sylvanex Lumber Products Inc. (Sylvanex) reported that they had received government assistance while in these expedited reviews, Sylvanex indicates that they received no government assistance.

Department's Position: As noted in numerous company-specific comments above, the company exclusion segment of the proceeding was different from the expedited review segment of the proceeding. Contrary to petitioners' assertion, during the exclusion process and by letter dated August 21, 2001, Sylvanex reported that it "did not benefit from other programs subject to this investigation." See the GOC's October 29, 2001, submission, of which a public version is on file in room B-099 of the Central Records Unit in the main Commerce Building. In addition, the October 10, 2001 certification supplied by Forest Renewal BC

indicated that Sylvanex received zero benefits from Forest Renewal BC. The benefit that petitioner states that Sylvanex reported during the exclusion process resulted from the reporting, by Forest Renewal BC of sums provided to various associations within British Columbia. These amounts were allocated to members of the associations for purposes of the exclusion applications alone. In these expedited reviews, the participating companies have submitted program usage information based on their own financial records and experience. Under this approach, Sylvanex again has reported that it did not use the Forest Renewal Program during the POR. Given the difference in reporting methodologies between the two proceedings and the fact that Sylvanex based its questionnaire response on its own financial data, we find the discrepancy raised by petitioners is adequately explained and, thus, does not call into question the veracity of the information submitted by Sylvanex in these expedited reviews.

Comment 6: Tyee Timber Products Ltd. According to petitioners, Tyee Timber Products (Tyee) indicated in the exclusion process that they were affiliated with another company. However, petitioners point out that in these expedited reviews, Tyee does not indicate that they are affiliated with any company. Moreover, the total sales of subject merchandise reported in the exclusion proceeding differs from the total sales of subject merchandise reported in their expedited review application. Lastly, petitioners argue that in Tyee's expedited review application the company indicated that no logs were used or purchased, however, they report in another section of the application that the company used British Columbian timber as inputs.

Department's Position: As explained above, the exclusion process was a different segment of the proceeding from these expedited reviews, and we have clarified in our questionnaires how the sales data should be derived for purposes of our analysis as well as how to report data related to logs harvested and purchased. With respect to whether Tyee reported affiliates in its expedited review application, as explained above, the reporting methodologies used by participating companies differed between the exclusion process and the expedited review process. In the exclusion process, companies signed certifications regarding their affiliation and cross-ownership status that were based on questionnaires and guidelines compiled and issued by the GOC. See

the GOC's October 29, 2001, submission. In contrast, in the expedited reviews, the Department has sent questionnaires directly to the participating companies that contain specific definitions and instructions regarding the issue of affiliation and cross-ownership. Therefore, it is entirely reasonable, since different authorities issued separate and different questionnaires, that some discrepancies would exist between the two proceedings. However, what is germane to the instant proceeding is what Tyee has stated regarding its affiliation and cross-ownership with other companies based on the definitions and instructions that were directly provided to it by the Department. On this point, Tyee has made clear in its application and questionnaire responses that it was not affiliated or cross-owned with any companies.

Comment 7: West Bay Forest Products and Manufacturing Ltd. Petitioners contend that West Bay Forest Products reported in the exclusion process different values for total sales of subject merchandise from the value they reported in their application for expedited review.

In response, West Bay Forest Products asserts that the financial information reported in their exclusion application reported total sales of all remanufactured softwood lumber. With respect to the expedited reviews, the company reported the combined total of remanufactured and resale sales amounts. Moreover, the company found an additional error in the total value of remanufactured sales reported in their original expedited review filing. In addition, the company provided a reconciliation of the difference between the figures in the two segments of the proceeding.

Department's Position: As explained above, we provided specific instructions on how to calculate sales figures in these expedited reviews. Therefore, the figures provided in the two segments of the proceeding are not directly comparable. Further, we find that the information submitted by West Bay Forest Products accounts for the differences in total sales values between the two segments of the proceeding.

Verification

In accordance with 782(I)(3) of the Act, we may verify information submitted by respondents who preliminarily received a *de minimis* subsidy rate, prior to making our final determination.