

action.

6. Possible designation of “user-driven” sites to serve companies not located in an anchor or magnet site but which are ready to pursue conducting activity under FTZ procedures. In the general interest of maximizing the linkage between FTZ site designation and FTZ activity at the site, a user-driven site would be limited in the context of a larger industrial park or business district where other companies interested in FTZ procedures might be able to locate in the future to the area(s) required for the company(ies) ready to pursue conducting activity under FTZ procedures.
7. Unlike anchor and magnet sites, user-driven sites could be designated through the current minor boundary modification (MBM) mechanism a rapid administrative action by the Board’s staff in addition to through FTZ Board action. A simplification of the MBM process would result from elimination of the need to “swap” like amounts of acreage from existing sites as long as the total acreage for existing and proposed sites remained within the standard 2,000-acre limit.
8. In addition to the one anchor site, general initial limits of five magnet sites and ten user-driven sites which could exist simultaneously for a single FTZ. Increases of the limits applicable to a specific grantee could be justified over a longer term based on FTZ activity at a significant percentage of the grantee’s designated sites. A grantee’s request for a permanent increase in its number of authorized sites would be a matter for consideration by the FTZ Board. Also, the special circumstances of regional (multi-county) FTZs could be taken into account by an alternative general initial limit for such zones of two magnet sites per county. (Other limits in the proposal would be unaffected by such an alternative initial limit on numbers of magnet sites for regional FTZs.)
9. Consistent with current practice for many expansion applications, magnet sites and user-driven sites would be subject to “sunset” time limits which would self-remove FTZ designation from a site if there had been no FTZ activity before the site’s sunset date (generally five years from the date of the site’s approval). Magnet sites and user-

driven sites would also be subject to ongoing “recycling” whereby FTZ activity at a site during the site’s initial sunset period would serve to push back the sunset date by another five years (when the sunset test based on FTZ activity would again apply).

It is important to note that the elements of the proposal support each other in furthering the goals of flexibility and focus for FTZ site designation (with important resulting resource- and efficiency-related benefits for the government). As such, a framework incorporating these types of elements would incorporate the package of elements as an available alternative to the Board’s current practice. FTZ grantees opting to manage their zones under the Board’s current framework would be unaffected by this proposal. As is currently the case, MBM actions would be approved by the Board’s staff while modifications to a zone’s “plan” (e.g., increase in authorized FTZ acreage, modification to service area) would be matters for the FTZ Board’s consideration.

In addition, in order to help the FTZ Board evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the alternative framework after actual experience with FTZ grantees, the FTZ staff would report to the Board on a periodic basis regarding the actual usage of the alternative framework. The staff’s reporting regarding implementation of the framework at individual participating FTZs would result from staff-initiated reviews and would not require any request or application from the grantee.

Public comment on this proposal is invited from interested parties. We ask that parties fax a copy of their comments, addressed to the Board’s Executive Secretary, to (202) 482-0002. We also ask that parties submit the original of their comments to the Board’s Executive Secretary at the following address: U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 2111, 1401 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20230. The closing period for the receipt of public comments is July 7, 2008. Any questions about this request for comments may be directed to the FTZ Board staff at (202) 482-2862.

Dated: May 2, 2008.

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. E8-10274 Filed 5-7-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-807]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from the Republic of Korea: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review and Reinstatement of the Antidumping Duty Order

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 8, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael J. Heaney or Robert James, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4475 and (202) 482-0649, respectively.

SUMMARY: On April 3, 2008, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** the final results of the antidumping duty changed circumstances review and reinstatement of the antidumping order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip from Korea. The review covered a single firm, Kolon Industries, Inc. (Kolon) and the period July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006. See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review and Reinstatement of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 73 FR 18259 (April 3, 2008) (*Final Results*). We are amending the *Final Results* to correct a ministerial error in the calculation of the cash deposit rate for Kolon pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(e).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 7, 2008, the Department received from Kolon a timely allegation of a ministerial error pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(c)(1). Kolon alleges an error in formatting product-specific control numbers. Kolon asserts the Department assigned a revised field of only 6 characters in length for the variable CONNUM2H in the home market comparison program while assigning a field length of 10 characters for the variable CONNUM2H in the margin program. Kolon argues that the effect of this error is to truncate some of the CONNUM2H values used for matching purposes in the final results. Petitioners did not comment on the alleged ministerial error.

Amended Final Results of Review

A ministerial error as defined in section 751(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the act) “includes errors in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical errors resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other type of unintentional error which the administering authority considers ministerial.” See also 19 CFR 351.224(f). After analyzing Kolon’s allegation, we have determined, in accordance with section 751(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.224(e), that the Department made a ministerial error in the final results by inadvertently setting the field length for CONNUM2H in the comparison market program to 6 characters rather than 10 characters. Therefore, we are amending the final results of this antidumping duty changed circumstances review of polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip from Korea. In these amended final results we have assigned a character length of 10 for the CONNUM2H variable used in the comparison market program. As a result of this correction, the weighted-average percentage margin for Kolon has changed from 1.53 percent to 1.52 percent. We will issue amended cash deposit instructions for these amended final results of this administrative review to U.S. Customs and Border Protection 15 days after publication of these amended final results. There are no changes to the rates applicable to any other companies under this antidumping order. See *Final Results*.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act and 19 CFR 351.224(e).

Dated: May 01, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8-10277 Filed 5-7-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[A-533-824, A-583-837]

Continuation of Antidumping Duty Orders on Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip from India and Taiwan

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

SUMMARY: As a result of the determinations by the Department of Commerce (the Department) and the

International Trade Commission (ITC) that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip (PET film) from India and Taiwan would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, the Department is publishing a notice of continuation for these antidumping duty orders.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 8, 2008.

CONTACT INFORMATION: Jacqueline Arrowsmith or Martha Douthit, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5255 or (202) 482-5050, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

The Department initiated and the ITC instituted sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on PET film from India and Taiwan, pursuant to Section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). See *Initiation of Five-year (“Sunset”) Reviews*, 72 FR 30544 (June 1, 2007) (*Notice of Initiation*).

As a result of its reviews, the Department found that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping, and therefore notified the ITC of the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail were the orders to be revoked. See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from India and Taiwan: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders*, 72 FR 57297 (October 9, 2007).

On April 10, 2008, the ITC determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on PET film from India and Taiwan would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. See *Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film, Sheet, and Strip from India and Taiwan* (Inv. Nos. 701-TA-415 and 731-TA-933-934, USITC Publication 3994 (Review) (April 2008)).

Scope of the Orders

The products covered by these orders are all gauges of raw, pretreated or primed PET film, whether extruded or coextruded. Excluded are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or

inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches thick. Imports of PET film are currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”) under item number 3920.62.00.90. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for the convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of these orders is dispositive. Since these orders were published, there was one scope determination for PET film from India, dated August 25, 2003. In this determination, requested by International Packaging Films Inc., the Department determined that tracing and drafting film is outside of the scope of the order on PET film from India. See *Notice of Scope Rulings*, 70 FR 24533 (May 10, 2005).

Continuation of the Orders

As a result of these determinations by the Department and the ITC that revocation of these antidumping duty orders would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act, the Department hereby orders the continuation of the antidumping duty orders on PET film from India and Taiwan. U.S. Customs and Border Protection will continue to collect antidumping duty cash deposits at the rates in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise.

The effective date of the continuation of these orders will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this notice of continuation. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act, the Department intends to initiate the next five-year review of these orders not later than 30 days prior to the fifth anniversary of the effective date of continuation.

This five-year (sunset) review and this notice are in accordance with section 751(c) of the Act and published pursuant to section 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 2, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8-10266 Filed 5-7-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S