

acres)—adjacent to Parcel A North, York; *Parcel C* (10 acres)—14 Barnhart Drive, York; *Parcel D* (2 acres)—16 Barnhart Drive, York; *Parcel E* (23 acres)—26 Barnhart Drive (15 acres) & 29 Barnhart Drive (8 acres), Hanover; *Parcel F* (9 acres)—PTIP Lots #32, 34, 37 and 38, adjoins Parcel E, York; Site 6 (27 acres)—Hanover Terminal, Center Street at CSXT Railroad, Hanover.

The applicant is requesting authority to reorganize the general-purpose zone by formally deleting the existing Parcel F (2 acres) of Site 4 and removing 500 acres of Site 4, Parcel A. The applicant is also requesting to add a 228-acre industrial park, 260 Hidden Lane, York County, to be designated as the new Parcel F of Site 4. The applicant is further requesting to delete Parcel B of Site 5 (Lot #11, 3 acres) and to replace it with a 24-acre site, located at 401 Moulstown Road in Penn Township, York County, PA.

The applicant also is requesting authority to expand the general-purpose zone to include 9 additional industrial sites in south central Pennsylvania, adjacent to the Harrisburg Customs port of entry: Proposed Site 7 (155 acres)—Greenspring Industrial Park, 305 Green Springs Road, York County; Site 8 (152 acres)—Fairview Business Park, McCarthy Drive and Industrial Drive, York County; Site 9 (182 acres, 3 parcels)—*Parcel A* (34 acres)—900 Kriner Road, Chambersburg; *Parcel B* (121 acres)—WCN Drive and Guilford Springs Road, Guilford Township, Franklin County; *Parcel C* (30 acres)—Guilford Springs Road, Guilford Township; Site 10 (1214 acres)—Cumberland Valley Business Park (formerly known as Letterkenny Army Depot), 5121A Coffey Avenue, Franklin County; Site 11 (310 acres)—Prologis Park 81, I-81 and Walnut Bottom Road, Cumberland County; Site 12 (242 acres)—LogistiCenter, Allen Road Extension and Distribution Drive, Carlisle; Site 13 (100 acres)—Capital Business Center, Dauphin County; *Parcel A* (11 acres)—400 First Street, Middletown; *Parcel B* (33 acres)—401 First Street, Middletown; *Parcel C* (16 acres)—400 First Street Expressway, Middletown; *Parcel D* (8 acres)—500 Industrial Lane, Middletown; *Parcel E* (15 acres)—600 Hunter Lane, Middletown; *Parcel F* (17 acres)—300 Hunter Lane, Middletown; Site 14 (164 acres)—Conewago Industrial Park, 1100 Zeager Road, Elizabethtown; and, Site 15 (70 acres)—LogistiCenter, 4950 Hanoverville Road, Bethlehem. No specific manufacturing requests are being made at this time. Such requests would be made to the Board on a case-by-case basis.

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 below:

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 U.S. Postal Service*: Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, FCB—4100W, 1401 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20230.

The closing period for their receipt is May 9, 2005. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to May 23, 2005).

A copy of the application will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board's Executive Secretary at address No. 1 listed above and Foreign-Trade Zone Corporation of Southeastern Pennsylvania, 601 Penn Street, Suite 101, Reading, Pennsylvania 19601.

Dated: March 1, 2005.

**Dennis Puccinelli,**

*Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 05-4617 Filed 3-8-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-122-840]

#### Initiation of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Canada

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is initiating a changed circumstances administrative review of the antidumping duty order of carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod (steel wire rod) from Canada<sup>1</sup> in response to a request from Mittal Canada Inc.

<sup>1</sup> 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) (*Antidumping Order*).

(Mittal), a Canadian exporter of steel wire rod from Canada to the United States. Mittal has requested that the Department conduct a changed circumstances review to determine that it is the successor-in-interest to Ispat Sidbec Inc. (Ispat), and as a result to find that steel wire rod manufactured and exported by Mittal should be accorded the same treatment previously accorded to Ispat in regards to the antidumping order on steel wire rod from Canada.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 9, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Daniel O'Brien or David Neubacher, at (202) 482-1376 or (202) 482-5823, respectively; AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On October 29, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on steel wire rod from Canada. See *Antidumping Order*. One of the companies subject to the investigation was Ispat. On January 14, 2005, Mittal requested that the Department determine that it had become the successor-in-interest of Ispat. See Letter from Ispat to Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Re: Expedited Changed Circumstances Review to Determine that Mittal Canada Inc is the successor-in-interest to Ispat Sidbec Inc./Administrative Review of Antidumping Duty Order Regarding Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada (January 14, 2005).

##### 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 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. This 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.

This 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. 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, 7213.91.3090, 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, 7227.90.6051, 7227.90.6053, 7227.90.6058, and 7227.90.6059 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

#### Initiation of Changed Circumstances Review

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department will conduct a changed circumstances review upon request from

an interested party or receipt of information concerning an antidumping duty order, when either of these shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of the order. In this case, the Department finds that the information submitted by Mittal provides sufficient evidence of changed circumstances to warrant a review to determine whether Mittal is the successor-in-interest to Ispat. Thus, in accordance with section 751(b) of the Act, the Department is initiating a changed circumstances review to determine whether Mittal is the successor-in-interest to Ispat for purposes of determining antidumping duty liability with respect to imports of steel wire rod from Canada produced and exported by Ispat and whether the order as applied to Ispat should apply to subject merchandise manufactured and exported by Mittal.

In making a successor-in-interest determination, the Department examines several factors including, but not limited to, changes in: (1) Management; (2) production facilities; (3) supplier relationships; and (4) customer base. *See, e.g., Notice of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Polychloroprene Rubber From Japan*, 67 FR 58 (Jan. 2, 2002); *Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460, 20462 (May 13, 1992). While no single factor or combination of these factors will necessarily provide a dispositive indication of a successor-in-interest relationship, the Department will generally consider the new company to be the successor to the previous company if the new company's resulting operation is not materially dissimilar to that of its predecessor. *See, e.g., Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 9979 (March 1, 1999); *Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944 (February 14, 1994). Thus, if the evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as the former company, the Department will accord the new company the same antidumping treatment as its predecessor.

With regard to Ispat, Mittal claims that the production facilities and contractual relationships with suppliers and customers remained unchanged after Mittal assumed control of the company. According to Mittal, its assets

have remained essentially the same as those of Ispat.

Mittal has requested that the Department initiate an expedited review pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(iii). However, because it is the Department's practice to examine changes in management and customer base as part of its analysis in such a determination, and Mittal has not addressed these factors, we are denying its request to conduct the changed circumstances review on an expedited basis.

The Department will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of preliminary results of changed circumstances review, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(i) (2004), which will set forth the factual and legal conclusions upon which our preliminary results are based, and a description of any action proposed based on those results. Interested parties may submit comments for consideration in the Department's preliminary results not later than 60 days after publication of this notice. Responses to those comments may be submitted not later than 10 days following submission of the comments. All written comments must be submitted in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303 (2004), and must be served on all interested parties on the Department's service list in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(f) (2004). The Department will issue its final results of review within 270 days after the date on which the changed circumstances review is initiated, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.216(e) (2004), and will publish these results in the **Federal Register**.

The current requirement for a cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties on all subject merchandise will continue unless and until it is modified pursuant to the final results of this changed circumstances review.

This notice is in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.222 of the Department's regulations.

Dated: March 3, 2005.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E5-996 Filed 3-8-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-822]

#### Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 9, 2005.

**SUMMARY:** On November 19, 2004, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** (69 FR 67701) a notice announcing the initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on helical spring lock washers from the People's Republic of China (PRC), covering the period October 1, 2003, through September 30, 2004, and one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise, Hangzhou Spring Washer Co., Ltd. (also known as Zhejiang Wanxin Group, Ltd.) (collectively, Hangzhou). We are now rescinding this review as a result of Shakeproof Assembly Components Division of Illinois Tool Works, Inc. (Shakeproof)'s withdrawal of its request for an administrative review. No other parties requested a review.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Charles Riggle at (202) 482-0650 or Marin Weaver at (202) 482-2336, Import Administration, Room 1870, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On October 18, 2004, Shakeproof, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), requested an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on helical spring lock washers from the PRC. On November 19, 2004, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i), we initiated an administrative review of this order for the period October 1, 2003, through September 30, 2004. *See Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 69 FR 67701. On January 31, 2005, Shakeproof withdrew its request for this review.

## Rescission of Review

The Department's regulations at 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) provide that the Department will rescind an administrative review if the party that requested the review withdraws its request for review within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review, or withdraws its request at a later date if the Department determines that it is reasonable to extend the time limit for withdrawing the request. Shakeproof was the only party to request this review and it withdrew its request within the 90-day period. Accordingly, this review is rescinded. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to U.S. Customs and Border Protection within 15 days of publication of these final results of review.

## Notification Regarding APOs

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction 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/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 violation which is subject to sanction.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: March 2, 2005.

**Barbara E. Tillman,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E5-995 Filed 3-8-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-583-831]

#### Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Taiwan: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 9, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Karine Gziryan or Melissa Blackledge, AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, Import