

party, the Crawfish Processors Alliance (CPA), within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i). On July 30, 2008, we received a complete substantive response from CPA within the 30-day deadline in accordance with 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). We did not receive responses from any other parties. Accordingly, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department has conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of the order.

Scope of Order

The product covered by this antidumping duty order is freshwater crawfish, in all its forms (whether washed or with fat on, whether purged or unpurged), grades, and sizes; whether frozen, fresh, or chilled; and regardless of how it is packed, preserved, or prepared. Excluded from the scope of the order are live crawfish and other whole crawfish, whether boiled, frozen, fresh, or chilled. Also excluded are saltwater crawfish of any type, and parts thereof. Freshwater crawfish tail meat is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 1605.40.10.10 and 1605.40.10.90, which are the new HTSUS numbers for prepared foodstuffs, indicating peeled crawfish tail meat and other, as introduced by the CBP in 2000, and HTSUS numbers 0306.19.00.10 and 0306.29.00.00, which are reserved for fish and crustaceans in general. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes only. The written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

The issues raised by CPA are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" (Decision Memo) from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary, dated October 29, 2008, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail if the order were to be revoked. The Decision Memo, which is a public document, is on file in the Central Records Unit, main Department of Commerce building, Room 1117, and is accessible on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Final Results of the Review

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the PRC would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average percentage margins:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Percentage Margin
China Everbright Trading Company	156.77
Binzhou Prefecture Foodstuffs Import Export Corp. Huaiyin Foreign Trade Corp. Yancheng Foreign Trade Corp.	119.39 91.50
Jiangsu Cereals, Oils & Foodstuffs Import & Export Corp.	108.05
Yancheng Baolong Aquatic Foods Co., Ltd.	122.92
Huaiyin Ningtai Fisheries Co., Ltd.	122.92
Nantong Delu Aquatic Food Co., Ltd.	122.92
PRC-wide Rate	201.63

This notice serves as a reminder to parties subject to the administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). 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.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: October 29, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8-26394 Filed 11-4-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-274-804]

Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Trinidad and Tobago; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On November 26, 2007, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order

on carbon and alloy steel wire rod (wire rod) from Trinidad and Tobago for the period of review (POR) October 1, 2006, through September 30, 2007.

We preliminarily determine that during the POR, ArcelorMittal Point Lisas Limited,¹ and its affiliate Mittal Steel North America Inc. (MSNA) (collectively, AMPL) made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise during the POR.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. The Department will issue the final results within 120 days after publication of the preliminary results.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 5, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephanie Moore or Jolanta Lawska, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-3692 or (202) 482-8362, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 29, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago; *see Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukraine*, 67 FR 65945 (*Wire Rod Orders*). On October 1, 2007, we published in the **Federal Register** the *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 72 FR 55741.

We received timely requests for review from petitioners,² and AMPL, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2). AMPL also requested that the Department revoke the antidumping duty order pursuant to 19 CFR

¹ ArcelorMittal Point Lisas Limited is the successor-in-interest to Mittal Steel Point Lisas Limited. *See Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Trinidad and Tobago: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 73 FR 30052 (May 23, 2008).

² The petitioners are Gerda Ameristeel U.S. Inc. (formerly Co-Steel Raritan, Inc.), Keystone Consolidated Industries, Inc., North Star Steel Texas, Inc., Nucor Steel Connecticut, Inc., and Rocky Mountain Steel Mills (collectively, petitioners).

351.222(b). On November 26, 2007, the Department published the notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review covering the period October 1, 2006, through September 30, 2007, naming AMPL as the respondent. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 72 FR 65938 (November 26, 2007). On November 28, 2007, we sent the initial questionnaire covering sections A through D to AMPL.

On December 4, 2007, petitioners requested that the Department obtain from AMPL necessary information in order to be able to determine the proper date of sale and a U.S. sales database that reflects the proper date of sale.

On February 4, 2008, AMPL submitted its sections A through C response to the Department's questionnaire. On February 19, 2008, AMPL submitted its section D response to the Department's questionnaire.

On February 27, 2008, the Department sent AMPL a supplemental questionnaire for sections A through C. We received the response to the supplemental questionnaire on March 26, 2008.

The Department issued a supplemental questionnaire for section D on May 21, 2008, and received the response on June 25, 2008. On August 13, 2008, the Department issued a second supplemental section D questionnaire, and on August 27, 2008, AMPL submitted its response.

On June 13, 2008, AMPL withdrew its request for revocation of the antidumping duty order because AMPL, after further analysis, determined that its estimated dumping margin is greater than *de minimis*, and hence it does not satisfy the requirements of 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2).

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to this order is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter. Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions for (a) stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining steel products (*i.e.*, products that contain by weight one or more of the following elements: 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur,

more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium).

Also excluded from the scope are 1080 grade tire cord quality wire rod and 1080 grade tire bead quality wire rod. Grade 1080 tire cord quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod measuring 5.0 mm or more but not more than 6.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.15 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.30 mm or less with 3 or fewer breaks per ton, and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.006 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium.

Grade 1080 tire bead quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod measuring 5.5 mm or more but not more than 7.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.2 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.78 mm or larger with 0.5 or fewer breaks per ton; and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of soluble aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.008 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) either not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium (if chromium is not specified), or not more than 0.10 percent in the aggregate of copper and nickel and a chromium content of 0.24 to 0.30 percent (if chromium is specified).

For purposes of grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and grade 1080 tire

bead quality wire rod, an inclusion will be considered to be deformable if its ratio of length (measured along the axis—that is, the direction of rolling—of the rod) over thickness (measured on the same inclusion in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod) is equal to or greater than three. The size of an inclusion for purposes of the 20 microns and 35 microns limitations is the measurement of the largest dimension observed on a longitudinal section measured in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod. This measurement methodology applies only to inclusions on certain grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and certain grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after July 24, 2003.

The designation of the products as “tire cord quality” or “tire bead quality” indicates the acceptability of the product for use in the production of tire cord, tire bead, or wire for use in other rubber reinforcement applications such as hose wire. These quality designations are presumed to indicate that these products are being used in tire cord, tire bead, and other rubber reinforcement applications, and such merchandise intended for the tire cord, tire bead, or other rubber reinforcement applications is not included in the scope. However, should petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such products for other than those applications, end-use certification for the importation of such products may be required. Under such circumstances, only the importers of record would normally be required to certify the end use of the imported merchandise.

All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope.

The products under review are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3010, 7213.91.3015, 7213.91.3090, 7213.91.3092, 7213.91.4510, 7213.91.4590, 7213.91.6010, 7213.91.6090, 7213.99.0031, 7213.99.0038, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0010, 7227.20.0020, 7227.20.0090, 7227.20.0095, 7227.90.6010, 7227.90.6051, 7227.90.6053, 7227.90.6058, 7227.90.6059, and 7227.90.6080 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes,

the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.³

U.S. Sales of Damaged Merchandise

During the POR, AMPL had a small volume of subject merchandise that was damaged during shipment to the United States. According to AMPL, the original customer refused the defective merchandise, which AMPL sold “as is” in the U.S. market. AMPL did not include these sales in its questionnaire response; AMPL stated these sales were not reported because they were outside the ordinary course of trade. However, in a supplemental questionnaire response, AMPL did provide the relevant details of the sale, including price and a copy of the invoice.

The statutory provisions concerning ordinary course of trade are only applicable to the calculation of NV based on home-market sales and not to the calculation of the constructed export price (CEP) based on U.S. sales; thus, this is not a basis for excluding these U.S. transactions. See *Notice of Final Results of the Tenth Administrative Review and New Shipper Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Republic of Korea*, 70 FR 12443 (March 14, 2005), and accompanying Issues and Decisions Memorandum at Discussion of Issues—Company-Specific Comment 6. Further, in antidumping duty administrative reviews we are assessing duties on all entries of subject merchandise. Therefore, we normally include all sales of subject merchandise during the period. Accordingly, we have included all sales of subject merchandise to the United States in the antidumping margin calculations. See *Preliminary Sales Calculation Memorandum for ArcelorMittal Point Lisas Limited* (Preliminary Sales Calculation Memorandum), dated October 30, 2008, which is on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU) at the Department, Room 1117.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), all products produced by the respondent covered by the description in the Scope of the Order section, above, and sold in Trinidad and Tobago during the POR are considered to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. We have

relied on eight criteria to match U.S. sales of subject merchandise to comparison market sales of the foreign like product: grade range, carbon content range, surface quality, deoxidation, maximum total residual content, heat treatment, diameter range, and coating. These characteristics have been weighted by the Department where appropriate. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the next most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics listed above.

Comparisons to Normal Value

To determine whether sales of wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago were made in the United States at less than NV, we compared the export price (EP) or CEP to the NV, as described in the “Export Price and Constructed Export Price” and “Normal Value” sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For the price to the United States, we used, as appropriate, EP or CEP, in accordance with sections 772(a) and (b) of the Act. We calculated EP when the merchandise was sold by the producer or exporter outside the United States directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and when CEP was not otherwise warranted based on the facts on the record. We calculated CEP for those sales where a person in the United States, affiliated with the foreign exporter or acting for the account of the exporter, made the sale to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States of the subject merchandise. We based EP and CEP on the packed prices charged to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States and the applicable terms of sale. When appropriate, we reduced these prices to reflect discounts and increased the prices to reflect billing adjustments.

In accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act, we made deductions, where appropriate, for movement expenses including inland freight, international freight, demurrage expenses, marine insurance, survey fees, U.S. customs duties and various U.S. movement expenses from arrival to delivery.

For CEP, in accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, when appropriate, we deducted from the starting price those selling expenses that were

incurred in selling the subject merchandise in the United States, including direct selling expenses (cost of credit and warranty). In addition, we deducted indirect selling expenses that related to economic activity in the United States. These expenses include certain indirect selling expenses incurred by affiliated U.S. distributors. We also deducted from CEP an amount for profit in accordance with sections 772(d)(3) and (f) of the Act.

Normal Value

A. Selection of Comparison Markets

To determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared AMPL's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of its U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Pursuant to sections 773(a)(1)(B) and 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act, because AMPL had an aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product that was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market was viable.

B. Cost of Production Analysis

In the most recently completed segment of the proceeding in which AMPL participated, the Department found that the respondent made sales in the home market at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise and excluded such sales from the calculation of NV. See *Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago*; *Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 36955, 36957 (July 6, 2007), unchanged in the *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago*, 72 FR 62824 (November 7, 2007). Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Department determined that there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that AMPL made sales of wire rod in Trinidad and Tobago at prices below the cost of production (COP) in this administrative review. As a result, we initiated a COP inquiry for AMPL.

1. Calculation of COP

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated a weighted-average COP based on the sum of the cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for selling, general, and administrative expenses, packing expenses, and interest expense. We did not make any

³ Effective July 1, 2008, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) reclassified certain HTSUS numbers related to the subject merchandise. See <http://hotdocs.usitc.gov/tariff--chapters--current/toc.html>.

adjustments to AMPL's submitted COP data.

2. Test of Comparison Market Prices

As required under section 773(b)(2) of the Act, we compared the weighted-average COP to the per-unit price of the comparison market sales of the foreign like product, to determine whether these sales were made at prices below the COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such prices were sufficient to permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. We determined the net comparison market prices for the below-cost test by subtracting from the gross unit price any applicable movement charges, discounts, rebates, direct and indirect selling expenses and packing expenses which were excluded from COP for comparison purposes.

3. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in "substantial quantities." Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we determined such sales to have been made in "substantial quantities." See section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act. Further, the sales were made within an extended period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act, because we examined below-cost sales occurring during the entire POR. In such cases, because we compared prices to POR-average costs, we also determined that such sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Therefore, for purposes of this administrative review, we disregarded below-cost sales of a given product and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

C. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Comparison Market Prices

We based home market prices on packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in Trinidad and Tobago. We adjusted the starting price for inland freight pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. In addition, for comparisons made to EP sales, we made adjustments for differences in circumstances of sale (COS) pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. We made

COS adjustments by deducting direct selling expenses incurred for home market sales (credit expense) and adding U.S. direct selling expenses (credit and warranty directly linked to sales transactions). No other adjustments to NV were claimed or allowed.

When comparing U.S. sales with comparison market sales of similar, but not identical, merchandise, we also made adjustments for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411. We based this adjustment on the difference in the variable cost of manufacturing for the foreign like product and subject merchandise, using POR-average costs.

D. Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade (LOT) as the EP or CEP transaction. In identifying LOTs for EP and comparison market sales (i.e., NV based on home market), we consider the starting prices before any adjustments. For CEP sales, we consider only the selling activities reflected in the price after the deduction of expenses and profit under section 772(d) of the Act. See *Micron Technology, Inc. v. United States*, 243 F.3d 1301, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP or CEP transactions, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison market sales are at a different LOT and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make an LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. For CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP-offset provision).

In the home market, AMPL reported sales made through one LOT corresponding to one channel of distribution. In the U.S. market, AMPL reported two LOTs corresponding to two channels of distribution. AMPL made sales to an unaffiliated trading company and through its U.S. affiliates. We have determined that the sales made

by AMPL directly to U.S. customers are EP sales and those made by AMPL's affiliated U.S. resellers constitute CEP sales. Furthermore, we have found that U.S. sales and home market sales were made at the same LOT. Accordingly, we did not find it necessary to make an LOT adjustment or CEP offset. For further explanation of our LOT analysis see the Preliminary Sales Calculation Memorandum.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period October 1, 2006, through September 30, 2007:

Producer/Manufacturer	Weighted-average margin
AMPL	1.56%

The Department will disclose calculations performed within five days of the date of publication of this notice to the parties of this proceeding in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). An interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of these preliminary results. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication, or the first working day thereafter, unless the Department alters the date pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii). Rebuttal briefs limited to issues raised in the case briefs may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication. See 19 CFR 351.309(d). Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Further, parties submitting written comments are requested to provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on diskette. The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, or at a hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results. See section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Assessment Rate

The Department shall determine and CBP shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b), the Department calculated an assessment rate for each importer of the subject merchandise.

Upon issuance of the final results of this administrative review, if any importer-specific assessment rates calculated in the final results are above *de minimis* (i.e., at or above 0.5 percent), the Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to CBP to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries by applying the assessment rate to the entered value of the merchandise. For assessment purposes, we calculate importer-specific assessment rates for the subject merchandise by aggregating the dumping margins for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing the amount by the total entered value of the sales to that importer. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of the final results of review.

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003. See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003) (*Assessment Policy Notice*). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by AMPL for which AMPL did not know that the merchandise it sold to the intermediary (e.g., a reseller, trading company, or exporter) was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediary involved in the transaction. See *Assessment Policy Notice* for a full discussion of this clarification.

Cash Deposit Requirements

To calculate the cash deposit rate for AMPL, we divided the total dumping margin by the total net value for AMPL's sales during the review period.

The following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for AMPL will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.5 percent and, therefore, *de minimis*, the cash deposit rate will be zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent final results in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-

value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent final results for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and, (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 11.40 percent, the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. See *Wire Rod Orders*. These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and increase the subsequent assessment of the antidumping duties by the amount of antidumping duties reimbursed.

These preliminary results of review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: October 30, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8-26395 Filed 11-4-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

National Estuarine Research Reserve System

AGENCY: Estuarine Reserves Division, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Public Comment Period for the Revised Management Plan for the Chesapeake Bay Virginia National Estuarine Research Reserve.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Estuarine Reserves Division, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Department of Commerce is announcing

a thirty day public comment period on the Chesapeake Bay Virginia National Estuarine Research Reserve Management Plan Revision.

Four sites along the York River comprise the Chesapeake Bay Virginia National Estuarine Research Reserve; Sweet Hall Marsh, Taskinas Creek, the Catlett Islands, and the Goodwin Islands. The four sites were designated as the Chesapeake Bay Virginia National Estuarine Research Reserve in 1991 pursuant to Section 315 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 1461. The reserve has been operating in partnership with the Virginia Institute of Marine Science under a management plan approved in 1991. Pursuant to 15 CFR section 921.33(c), a state must revise their management plan every five years. The submission of this plan fulfills this requirement and sets a course for successful implementation of the goals and objectives of the reserve. A boundary expansion, a revised geographic vision for the reserve, new facilities, and updated programmatic objectives are notable revisions to the 1991 approved management plan.

The revised management plan outlines the administrative structure; the education, stewardship, and research goals of the reserve; and the plans for future land acquisition and facility development to support reserve operations. This management plan describes how the strengths of the reserve will focus on four areas relevant to the Chesapeake Bay: functions and linkages of land-margin ecosystems; ecosystem vulnerability to climate and human-induced stressors; water quality and aquatic stressors; and integrated ocean observing systems.

Since 1991, the reserve has added a coastal training program that delivers science-based information to key decision makers in the Chesapeake Bay; has completed a site profile that characterizes the reserve; and has expanded the monitoring, stewardship and education programs significantly. A new administrative building (2003) and a new science and education lab (2005) have been built to support the growth of reserve programs.

With the approval of this management plan, the Chesapeake Bay Virginia National Estuarine Research Reserve will change their total acreage from 2,849 acres to a new total of 2,705 acres. This change is attributable to boundary modifications at two of the reserve sites. At Sweet Hall Marsh, 189 acres of reserve property are being removed from the reserve boundary due to a change in ownership. At the Taskinas Creek site, 44.5 acres are being added to the reserve