(5,725 acres) in the Montgomery County area: Site 1 (5,170 acres)—Dannelly Field Airport Industrial Complex located on Interstate 65 on the south side of Montgomery (1,968 acres), the adjacent Interstate Enterprise Zone (3,024 acres), and the adjoining Catoma Industrial Park (178 acres); and, Site 2 (555 acres)—Gunter Industrial Park located adjacent to Montgomery's Northern Bypass.

The applicant is now requesting authority to expand the general purpose zone to include two additional sites (1,412 acres) in Montgomery County: Proposed Site 3 (1,044 acres)—Airport Industrial Commercial Park located on U.S. Highway 80; and, Proposed Site 4 (368 acres)—Montgomery County Technology Park located on Interstate 85 east and north of existing Site 1. *Proposed Site 3* is currently being utilized by a variety of tenants for light manufacturing activities and has additional lots available for build-to-suit applications. Proposed Site 4 is currently under development and will be zoned for manufacturing and warehousing activities. Proposed Site 3 is primarily owned by Elias Industries, Inc., and *Proposed Site 4* is owned by the Montgomery County Commission. No specific manufacturing requests are being made at this time. Such requests would be made to the board on a caseby-case basis. The sites will provide public warehousing and distribution services to area businesses.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment on the application is invited from interested parties.
Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at one of the following addresses:

1. Submissions via Express/Package Delivery Services: Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Franklin Court Building-Suite 4100W, 1099 14th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005; or,

2. Submissions via the U.S. Postal Service: Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, FCB-Suite 4100W, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

The closing period for their receipt is February 14, 2005. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to February 28, 2005).

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available during this time for public inspection at the address Number 1 listed above, and at the Montgomery Area Chamber of Commerce, 41 Commerce Street, Montgomery, AL 36104.

Dated: December 8, 2004.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–27379 Filed 12–13–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 1361]

Approval for Expansion of Subzone 77A, Sharp Manufacturing Company of America Plant (Microwave Ovens, Computer Products, and Solar Cell Modules); Shelby County, TN

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, the City of Memphis, Tennessee, grantee of FTZ 77, has requested authority on behalf of Sharp Manufacturing Company of America to expand the scope of manufacturing authority under zone procedures (multifunction office machines and solar cell modules) at Subzone 77A at the Sharp Manufacturing Company of America plant in Shelby County, Tennessee (FTZ Docket 61–2003, filed 11/6/2003);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment has been given in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 65246, 11/19/03);

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendation of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations are satisfied, and that the proposal is in the public interest;

Now, therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The application to expand the scope of authority under zone procedures within Subzone 77A on behalf of the Sharp Manufacturing Company of America, is approved, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 6th day of December, 2004.

James J. Jochum,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

Dennis Puccinelli,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–27377 Filed 12–13–04; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 34-2004]

Proposed Foreign-Trade Zone— Conroe (Montgomery County), TX Extension of Rebuttal Comment Period

The rebuttal comment period for the application to establish a general-purpose foreign-trade zone in Conroe (Montgomery County), Texas, submitted by the City of Conroe, Texas (69 FR 51060, 8/17/04), is being extended to December 20, 2004, at the request of the applicant.

Dated: December 6, 2004.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–27378 Filed 12–13–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A-475-818)

Certain Pasta from Italy: Extension of Time Limits for the Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the due date for the preliminary results of review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy from April 4, 2005, to July 18, 2005.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 14, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Dennis McClure at (202) 482–5973, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to issue the preliminary results of a review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested and the final results within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within that time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary results to a maximum of 365 days and for the final results to 180 days (or 300 days if the Department does not extend the time limit for the preliminary results) from the date of the publication of the preliminary results.

Background

On August 30, 2004, the Department published a notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy, covering the period July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004 (69 FR 52857). The preliminary results are currently due no later than April 4, 2005.

Extension of Preliminary Results of Review

There are six Italian respondents in this review, two of whom have requested revocation. The Department needs additional time to consider issues related to whether revocation is appropriate for the companies requesting it and to conduct verifications, if needed. Specifically, certain of the companies have multiple factories and sales offices and have presented issues of affiliation which will require additional time to analyze.

We, therefore, determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time limit and are extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until no later than July 18, 2005. We intend to issue the final results no later than 120 days after the publication of the notice of preliminary results of this review.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: December 7, 2004.

Barbara E. Tillman,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E4–3639 Filed 12–13–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510ndash;DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration [A-475-818]

Certain Pasta from Italy: Notice of Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to requests by Pastificio Carmine Russo S.p.A. and its affiliate, Pastificio DiNola S.p.A. (collectively, Russo/DiNola), and others, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta (pasta) from Italy for the period July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004. We initiated the review on a total of seven companies including Russo/ DiNola. Based on a timely withdrawal of its request for review, we are rescinding the administrative review of Russo/ DiNola. The administrative review of the antidumping duty order continues with respect to Barilla, G.e.R. (Barilla), Corticella Molini E Pastifici S.p.A. and its affiliate Pasta Combattenti S.p.A. (collectively, Corticella/Combattenti), Industria Alimentare Colvaita S.p.A. and its affiliate Fusco S.r.L. (collectively, Indalco), Pastificio Fratelli Pagani S.p.A. (Pagani), Pastificio Antonio Pallante S.r.L. and its affiliate Industrie Alimentari Molisane S.r.L. (collectively, Pallante/IAM) and Pastificio Riscossa F.lli Mastromauro S.r.L. (Riscossa).

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 14, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

James Terpstra or Dennis McClure, 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) 482–3965, or (202) 482–5973, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this order are shipments of certain non–egg dry pasta in packages of five pounds four ounces or less, whether or not enriched or fortified or containing milk or other optional ingredients such as chopped vegetables, vegetable purees, milk, gluten, diastasis, vitamins, coloring and flavorings, and up to two percent egg white. The pasta covered by this scope is typically sold in the retail market, in fiberboard or cardboard cartons, or polyethylene or polypropylene bags of varying dimensions.

Excluded from the scope of this review are refrigerated, frozen, or canned pastas, as well as all forms of egg pasta, with the exception of non-egg dry pasta containing up to two percent egg white. Also excluded are imports of organic pasta from Italy that are accompanied by the appropriate certificate issued by the Instituto Mediterraneo Di Certificazione, by Bioagricert International (formerly Bioagricoop Scrl), by QC&I International Services, by Ecocert Italia, by Consorzio per il Controllo dei Prodotti Biologici, or by Associazione Italiana per l'Agricoltura Biologica.

The merchandise subject to review is currently classifiable under item 1902.19.20 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS)*. Although the *HTSUS* subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise subject to the order is dispositive.

Background

On July 1, 2004, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy. See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review, 69 FR 39903 (July 1, 2004). On August 30, 2004, pursuant to requests made by Russo/DiNola, Pagani, Pallante/IAM Corticella/Combattenti, Indalco, Barilla, and the petitioners (New World Pasta Company, American Italian Pasta Company, and Dakota Growers Pasta Company), the Department initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy. See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part, 69 FR 52857 (August 30, 2004). On October 19, 2004, Russo/ DiNola timely withdrew its request for an administrative review.

Rescission of Review

If a party that requested a review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review, the Secretary will rescind the review pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). In this case, Russo/DiNola withdrew its request for an administrative review within 90 days from the date of initiation. No other interested party requested a review of this company. Because Russo/DiNola filed a timely request for withdrawal of this administrative review by the deadline and it was the only request for review