

until after completion of the final environmental impact statement may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45 day comment period so that comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft environmental impact statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Comments received, including the names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposal and will be available for public inspection.

Authority: 40 CFR 1501.7 and 1508.22; Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, Section 21.

Dated: May 1, 2008.

Stanley G. Sylva,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. E8-10235 Filed 5-9-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A-122-840)

Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On November 7, 2007, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire

rod from Canada. *See Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Canada*, 72 FR 62816 (November 7, 2007) (*Preliminary Results*). This review covers the period October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006, for Ivaco Rolling Mills 2004 L.P. ("IRM") and Sivaco Ontario (a division of Sivaco Wire Group 2004 L.P.) ("Sivaco") (referred to collectively as Ivaco).

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 12, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Steve Bezirgianian 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) 482-1131 or (202) 482-0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On November 7, 2007, the Department published the preliminary results of this administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Canada. *See Preliminary Results*, 72 FR 62816. This review covers Ivaco for the period October 1, 2005, to September 30, 2006. On November 29, 2007, we sent a supplemental questionnaire to Ivaco pertaining to the level of trade issue. Ivaco submitted its response on December 13, 2007. Petitioners (Mittal Steel USA Inc. - Georgetown, Gerdau USA Inc., Nucor Steel Connecticut Inc., Keystone Consolidated Industries, Inc., and Rocky Mountain Steel Mills) provided comments on Ivaco's response on December 21, 2007. Ivaco responded to petitioners' comments on December 31, 2007. The Department extended the deadlines for filing case briefs and rebuttal briefs because of its request for new information after issuing its preliminary results. Ivaco and petitioners submitted their case briefs on January 23, 2008, and rebuttal briefs on January 30, 2008. A hearing was held on February 27, 2008. On February 28, 2008, we published in the **Federal Register** our notice fully extending the time limit for this review until May 5, 2008. *See Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Canada: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 10743 (February 28, 2008).

Period of Review

The period of review is October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006.

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 the grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and the 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.

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 subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3011, 7213.91.3015,

7213.91.3092, 7213.91.4500, 7213.91.6000, 7213.99.0030, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0000, 7227.90.6010, 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.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated May 5, 2008 (Decision Memorandum), which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues that parties have raised and to which we have responded, all of which are in the Decision Memorandum (and, for the level of trade issue, in a separate proprietary document referenced in the Decision Memorandum), is attached to this notice as an appendix. Parties can find a 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 in room 1117 in the main Department building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly via the Internet at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have corrected the programming language so that the arm’s–length test runs properly. This change is discussed in the relevant section of the Decision Memorandum, and in “Analysis Memorandum for the Final Results of the Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada (A–122–840): Ivaco.”

Final Results of Review

We determine the following weighted–average percentage margin exists for the period October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Weighted Average Margin
Ivaco	2.98 percent

Assessment

The Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, pursuant to section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department calculated an assessment rate for each importer of the subject merchandise covered by the review. Upon issuance of the final results of this review, for any importer–specific assessment rates calculated in the final results that are above *de minimis* (i.e., at or above 0.50 percent), we will issue assessment instructions directly to CBP to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries by applying the assessment rate to the entered value of the merchandise. Pursuant to 19 CFR 356.8(a), the Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 41 days after the date of publication of these 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). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the period of review produced by Ivaco for which Ivaco did not know the merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the 8.11 percent all–others rate if there is no company–specific rate for an intermediary involved in the transaction. *See id.*

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of administrative review, consistent with section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate listed above; (2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, but was covered in a previous review or the original less than fair value (LTFV) investigation, 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 prior 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 8.11 percent, the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. See *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada*, 67 FR 65944 (October 29, 2002). These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice also serves as a final 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 Department's presumption that reimbursement of the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305, which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. 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 the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

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

Dated: May 5, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix – Issues and Decision Memorandum

Comment 1: Adjustment to Pension Liabilities

Comment 2: Adjustment to General & Administrative Expenses

Comment 3: Arm's–Length Program

Comment 4: Level of Trade

Comment 5: Offsetting for U.S. Sales that Exceed Normal Value

[FR Doc. E8–10514 Filed 5–9–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(C–570–938)

Notice of Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation: Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts from the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 12, 2008

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Neubacher, Scott Holland, and Shelly Atkinson, AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5823, (202) 482–1279, and (202) 482–0116, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petition

On April 14, 2008, the Department of Commerce (the “Department”) received a petition filed in proper form by Archer Daniels Midland Company, Cargill, Inc., and Tate and Lyle Americas, Inc. (the “petitioners”), domestic producers of citric acid and certain citrate salts (“citric acid”). On April 22, 2008, the Department received a supplement to the petition alleging several additional subsidy programs. In response to the Department's requests, the petitioners provided timely information supplementing the petition on April 24, 2008 and April 28, 2008.

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), the petitioners allege that manufacturers, producers, or exporters of citric acid in the People's Republic of China (the “PRC”), receive countervailable subsidies within the meaning of section 701 of the Act and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that the petitioners filed the petition on behalf of the domestic industry because they are interested parties as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and the petitioners have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the countervailing duty investigation (see “Determination of Industry Support for the Petition” section below).

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation is January 1, 2007, through December 31, 2007.

Scope of the Investigation

The scope of this investigation includes all grades and granulation sizes of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate in their unblended forms, whether dry or in solution, and regardless of packaging type. The scope also includes blends of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate; as well as blends with other ingredients, such as sugar, where the unblended form(s) of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate constitute 40 percent or more, by weight, of the blend. The scope of this investigation also includes all forms of unrefined calcium citrate, including dicalcium citrate monohydrate, and tricalcium citrate tetrahydrate, which are intermediate products in the production of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate. The scope of this investigation includes the hydrous and anhydrous forms of citric acid, the dihydrate and anhydrous forms of sodium citrate, otherwise known as citric acid sodium salt, and the monohydrate and monopotassium forms of potassium citrate. Sodium citrate also includes both trisodium citrate and monosodium citrate, which are also known as citric acid trisodium salt and citric acid monosodium salt, respectively. Citric acid and sodium citrate are classifiable under 2918.14.0000 and 2918.15.1000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”), respectively. Potassium citrate and calcium citrate are classifiable under 2918.15.5000 of the HTSUS. Blends that include citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate are classifiable under 3824.90.9290 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

Comments on Scope of Investigation

During our review of the petition, we discussed the scope with the petitioners to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. Moreover, as discussed in the preamble to the regulations (*Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997)), we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all interested parties to submit such comments within 20 calendar days of the publication of this notice. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration's Central Records Unit (“CRU”), Room 1117, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street