duty reviews, the interested party must specify the individual producers or exporters covered by an antidumping finding or an antidumping or countervailing duty order or suspension agreement for which it is requesting a review. In addition, a domestic interested party or an interested party described in section 771(9)(B) of the Act must state why it desires the Secretary to review those particular producers or exporters.² If the interested party intends for the Secretary to review sales of merchandise by an exporter (or a producer if that producer also exports merchandise from other suppliers) which were produced in more than one country of origin and each country of origin is subject to a separate order, then the interested party must state specifically, on an order-by-order basis, which exporter(s) the request is intended to cover.

Please note that, for any party the Department was unable to locate in prior segments, the Department will not accept a request for an administrative review of that party absent new information as to the party's location. Moreover, if the interested party who files a request for review is unable to locate the producer or exporter for which it requested the review, the interested party must provide an explanation of the attempts it made to locate the producer or exporter at the same time it files its request for review, in order for the Secretary to determine if the interested party's attempts were reasonable, pursuant to section 351.303(f)(3)(ii) of the Department's regulations.

As explained in Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings:
Assessment of Antidumping Duties, 68
FR 23954 (May 6, 2003), the Department has clarified its practice with respect to the collection of final antidumping duties on imports of merchandise where intermediate firms are involved. The public should be aware of this

clarification in determining whether to request an administrative review of merchandise subject to antidumping findings and orders. *See also* the Import Administration Web site at http://ia.ita.doc.gov.

Six copies of the request should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. The Department also asks parties to serve a copy of their requests to the Office of Antidumping/ Countervailing Operations, Attention: Sheila Forbes, in room 3065 of the main Commerce Building. Further, in accordance with section 351.303(f)(l)(i) of the Department's regulations, a copy of each request must be served on every party on the Department's service list.

The Department will publish in the Federal Register a notice of "Initiation of Administrative Review of Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation" for requests received by the last day of August 2010. If the Department does not receive, by the last day of August 2010, a request for review of entries covered by an order, finding, or suspended investigation listed in this notice and for the period identified above, the Department will instruct CBP to assess antidumping or countervailing duties on those entries at a rate equal to the cash deposit of (or bond for) estimated antidumping or countervailing duties required on those entries at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption and to continue to collect the cash deposit previously ordered.

For the first administrative review of any order, there will be no assessment of antidumping or countervailing duties on entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the relevant provisional-measures "gap" period, of

the order, if such a gap period is applicable for the POR.

This notice is not required by statute but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: July 27, 2010.

Edward C. Yang,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2010–18936 Filed 7–30–10; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Advance Notification of Sunset Reviews

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

Background

Every five years, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), the Department of Commerce ("the Department") and the International Trade Commission automatically initiate and conduct a review to determine whether revocation of a countervailing or antidumping duty order or termination of an investigation suspended under section 704 or 734 of the Act would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping or a countervailable subsidy (as the case may be) and of material injury.

Upcoming Sunset Reviews for September 2010

The following Sunset Reviews are scheduled for initiation in September 2010 and will appear in that month's Notice of Initiation of Five-Year Sunset Reviews.

	Department contact
Antidumping Duty Proceedings	
Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film from South Korea (A-580-807) (3rd Review)	Dana Mermelstein (202) 482–1391.
Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Japan (A-588-702) (3rd Review)	Dana Mermelstein (202) 482–1391.
Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from South Korea (A–580–813) (3rd Review)	Dana Mermelstein (202) 482–1391.
Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan (A-583-816) (3rd Review)	

² If the review request involves a non-market economy and the parties subject to the review request do not qualify for separate rates, all other

Countervailing Duty Proceedings

No Sunset Review of countervailing duty orders is scheduled for initiation in September 2010.

Suspended Investigations

No Sunset Review of suspended investigations is scheduled for initiation in September 2010.

The Department's procedures for the conduct of Sunset Reviews are set forth in 19 CFR 351.218. Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of Sunset Reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98.3-Policies Regarding the Conduct of Fiveyear ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998). The Notice of Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Reviews provides further information regarding what is required of all parties to participate in Sunset Reviews.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.103(c), the Department will maintain and make available a service list for these proceedings. To facilitate the timely preparation of the service list(s), it is requested that those seeking recognition as interested parties to a proceeding contact the Department in writing within 10 days of the publication of the Notice of Initiation.

Please note that if the Department receives a Notice of Intent to Participate from a member of the domestic industry within 15 days of the date of initiation, the review will continue. Thereafter, any interested party wishing to participate in the Sunset Review must provide substantive comments in response to the notice of initiation no later than 30 days after the date of initiation.

This notice is not required by statute but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: July 20, 2010.

Edward C. Yang,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2010-18929 Filed 7-30-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board (Docket 46-2010)

Foreign-Trade Zone 138 - Columbus, Ohio Area, Application for Reorganization under Alternative Site Framework

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) by the Columbus Regional Airport Authority, grantee of FTZ 138, requesting authority to reorganize the zone under the alternative site framework (ASF) adopted by the Board (74 FR 1170, 1/12/09; correction 74 FR 3987, 1/22/09). The ASF is an option for grantees for the establishment or reorganization of general-purpose zones and can permit significantly greater flexibility in the designation of new "usage-driven" FTZ sites for operators/ users located within a grantee's "service area" in the context of the Board's standard 2,000-acre activation limit for a general-purpose zone project. The application was submitted pursuant to the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR part 400). It was formally filed on July 21, 2010.

FTZ 138 was approved on March 13, 1987 (Board Order 351, 52 FR 9319, 3/24/87) and expanded on February 23, 1994 (Board Order 685, 59 FR 10783, 3/8/94), on November 9, 1999 (Board Order 1063, 64 FR 63786, 11/22/99), on May 29, 2001 (Board Order 1166, 66 FR 32933, 6/19/01), on December 19, 2003 (Board Order 1311, 69 FR 49, 1/2/04) and on November 2, 2007 (Board Order 1530, 72 FR 65563; 11/21/07).

The general-purpose zone currently consists of the following sites: Site 1 (3,787 acres total) -- portions of the Rickenbacker Inland Port - includes certain acreage within the Rickenbacker International Airport and Air Industrial Park, Alum Creek East Industrial Park, Alum Creek West Industrial Park, and Groveport Commerce Center, Franklin County; Site 2 (136 acres) -- Gateway Business Park, McClain Road, Lima, Allen County; Site 3 (42 acres) -- within the 90-acre Gateway Interchange Industrial Park, State Route 104 and U.S. Route 35, Chillicothe, Ross County; Site 4 (64 acres, 2 parcels) -- within the 960-acre Rock Mill Industrial Park, south of Mill Park Drive, Lancaster, Fairfield County; Site 5 (133 acres) -within the 149–acre D.O. Hall Business Center, State Route 660 and north of Reitler Road, Cambridge, Guernsey County; Site 6 (74 acres, 2 parcels) -within the Eagleton Industrial Park,

State Route 142 and west of Spring Valley Road, London, Madison County: Site 12 (31 acres) -- Marion Industrial Park, 1110 Cheney Avenue, Marion, Marion County; Site 13 (41 acres) --Capital Park South, 3125-3325 Lewis Centre Way, Grove City, Franklin County; Site 14 (27 acres) -- Southpointe Industrial Park, 3901 Gantz Road, Grove City, Franklin County; Site 15 (50 acres, sunset 12/31/2011) -- Columbus Industrial District, located at 4545 Fisher Road, Columbus, Franklin County; Site 16 (74 acres, expires 9/1/ 2010) -- located at 1809 Wilson Road, Columbus, Franklin County; Site 17 (9 acres, expires 7/31/2011) -- Quarry East Commerce Center (Drew Shoe Company), located at 252 Quarry Drive, Lancaster, Fairfield County; Site 18 (22 acres, expires 9/1/2010) -- located at 700 Manor Park, Columbus, Franklin County; and, Site 19 (1 acre, expires 9/ 1/2010) -- located at 330 Oak Street, Columbus, Franklin County.

The grantee's proposed service area under the ASF would be Athens, Champaign, Clark, Coshocton, Crawford, Delaware, Fairfield, Franklin, Guernsey, Highland, Hocking, Knox, Licking, Logan, Madison, Marion, Morrow, Muskingum, Perry, Pickaway, Pike, Ross, Union, Vinton and Wyandot Counties, Ohio, as described in the application. If approved, the grantee would be able to serve sites throughout the service area based on companies' needs for FTZ designation. The proposed service area is within and adjacent to the Columbus Customs and Border Protection port of entry. The grantee also proposes to retain its existing site (Site 2) in Lima (Allen County).

The applicant is requesting authority to reorganize its existing zone project to include Sites 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 15 as "magnet" sites and Sites 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18 as "usage-driven" sites. The ASF allows for the possible exemption of one magnet site from the "sunset" time limits that generally apply to sites under the ASF, and the applicant proposes that Site 1 be so exempted. The applicant is also requesting authority to remove 193 acres of undeveloped land from Site 1 (Alum Creek West Industrial Park), to remove 41 acres from Site 2, to delete Site 3 in its entirety, to remove 29 acres from Site 4, to remove 6 acres from Site 6, to remove 33 acres from Site 13, to remove 20 acres from Site 14, and to delete Site 19 in its entirety. Because the ASF only pertains to establishing or reorganizing a general-purpose zone, the application would have no impact on FTZ 138's authorized subzones.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, Claudia Hausler of the FTZ