

Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, the Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport Board, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 39, submitted an application to the Board for authority to reorganize and expand Site 2 (Dallas Logistics Hub—1,949 acres) and to expand the zone to include additional sites located at the Duke Intermodal Park in Hutchins (Site 7—39 acres), within the Sunridge Business Park in Wilmer (Site 8—434 acres), at the Dalport Business Park in Wilmer (Site 9—356 acres), within the Lancaster Municipal Airport Complex in Lancaster (Site 10—50 acres), at the ProLogis 20/35 Industrial Park in Lancaster (Site 11—175 acres), and at the Crossroads Trade Center in DeSoto (Site 12—112 acres), within the Dallas Customs and Border Protection port of entry (FTZ Docket 35—2007, filed 8/8/07);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (72 FR 46603, 8/21/07) and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations 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 reorganize and expand FTZ 39 is approved, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28, and subject to the Board's standard 2,000-acre activation limit for the overall general-purpose zone project, and further subject to a sunset provision that would terminate authority on March 31, 2015, for Sites 2, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12 where no activity has occurred under FTZ procedures before that date.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 27th day of February 2008.

David M. Spooner,

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

ATTEST:

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. E8-5048 Filed 3-12-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-830]

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

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

SUMMARY: On November 7, 2007, the Department published the preliminary results of its fourth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico. The review covers one producer of the subject merchandise, Hylsa Puebla, S.A. de C.V. ("Hylsa"). The period of review ("POR") is October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006. Based on our analysis of comments received, these final results differ from the preliminary results. The final results are listed below in the "Final Results of Review" section.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 13, 2008

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Conniff or Jolanta Lawska, Office 3, Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-1009 or (202) 482-8362, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On November 7, 2007, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the fourth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico. *See Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Steel Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Mexico*, 72 FR 62820 November 7, 2007 ("Preliminary Results").

We invited parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. On December 7, 2007, we received case briefs from Hylsa and petitioners.¹ On December 12, 2007, Hylsa and petitioners submitted rebuttal briefs. No party requested a hearing.

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. 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

¹ Petitioners are Mittal Steel USA Inc. - Georgetown, Gerdau USA Inc., Nucor Steel Connecticut Inc., Keystone Consolidated Industries Inc., and Rocky Mountain Steel Mills.

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 the 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 proceeding is dispositive.²

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal brief by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary ("Wire Rod Decision Memorandum"), which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues addressed in the Wire Rod Decision Memorandum is appended to this notice. The Wire Rod Decision Memorandum is on file in the Central Records Unit in Room 1117 of the main Commerce building, and can also be accessed directly on the Web at www.ia.ita.doc.gov/frn. The paper copy and electronic version of the Wire Rod Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of comments received for Hylsa, we have recalculated Hylsa's credit expenses incurred in the home market. Hylsa's adjustments are discussed in detail in the accompanying Wire Rod Decision Memorandum. See March 6, 2008, Final Calculation Memorandum for Hylsa.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following weighted-average margin exists for the period October 01, 2005, through September 30, 2006:

Producer	Weighted-Average Margin (Percentage)
Hylsa	17.94

Assessment Rate

The Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b). For Hylsa, the Department has calculated

² Effective January 1, 2006, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) reclassified certain HTSUS numbers related to the subject merchandise. See http://hotdocs.usitc.gov/tariff/chapters_current/toc.html.

importer-specific duty assessment rate on the basis of the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of the examined sales for that importer. Where the assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess duties on all entries of subject merchandise by that importer. Pursuant to 19 CFR 356.8, the Department shall not order liquidation until the "forty-first day after the date of publication of the notice . . ." following an administrative review of merchandise exported from Canada or Mexico. Accordingly, the Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 41 days after the publication of these final results of review. See, e.g., *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Softwood Lumber Products From Canada*, 70 FR 73437, 73443 (December 12, 2005).

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results, as provided by section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"): (1) for Hylsa, the cash deposit rate will be the rate listed above; (2) for merchandise exported by producers or exporters not covered in this review but covered a prior segment, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate from the final results; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or a prior segment, but the producer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the producer of the merchandise in these final results of review or in the final determination; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the producer is a firm covered in this review or the investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 17.70 percent, the all-others rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until further notice.

Reimbursement of Duties

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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 Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent increase in antidumping duties by the amount of antidumping duties reimbursed.

Administrative Protective Order

This notice also is the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. 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 the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing these results and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 6, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

APPENDIX

I. List of Comments:

Hylsa Puebla S.A. de C.V. ("Hylsa")
Comment 1: Treatment of Sales with Negative Dumping Margins ("Zeroing")
Comment 2: Calculation of Home Market Credit Expenses
Comment 3: Treatment of Dollar-Denominated Home Market Sales
 [FR Doc. E8-5046 Filed 3-12-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE: 3510-DR-S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Preparation of the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (SPEIS) for Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment To Support Operations in the Pacific Theater

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Army intends to prepare an SPEIS in order to evaluate the relative environmental and socioeconomic impacts of support operations growth in the Pacific Theater as it transforms and aligns its forces to address existing capabilities shortfalls. As part of Army growth, this evaluation will be conducted to supplement the analysis and decisions that were included in the PEIS for Grow the Army (for continental U.S. (CONUS)

locations), which was completed in January 2008.

The Army will use the SPEIS analysis to evaluate and compare the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of alternatives for implementing its Proposed Action. The Army's Proposed Action is to grow, realign, and transform its forces to support operations in the Pacific Theater and to ensure the proper capabilities exist to sustain operations in promoting global and national security now and into the foreseeable future. The implementation of the Proposed Action is needed to better meet military operational and national security requirements and the needs of the Army's Soldiers and their Families.

The SPEIS will assess the capacity of Army installations and their ability to accommodate new units as part of Army growth and force structure realignment to support operations in the Pacific Theater. Alternatives in the SPEIS could include stationing of additional Combat Support (CS) or Combat Service Support (CSS) units or new support brigades. The following alternatives will be analyzed in the SPEIS: (1) Grow, transform, and realign forces by stationing approximately 5,000 additional CS/CSS Soldiers in reasonable locations that support operations in the Pacific Theater; (2) Grow, transform, and realign forces by stationing approximately 7,500 additional CS/CSS Soldiers in reasonable locations that support operations in the Pacific Theater and (3) Grow, transform, and realign forces by stationing approximately 10,000 additional CS/CSS Soldiers in reasonable locations that support operations in the Pacific Theater. The SPEIS will evaluate different stationing scenarios in reasonable locations, which may include Army installations in the CONUS, Hawaii and Alaska with the capability to support operations in the Pacific Theater.

In addition to the above alternatives, the No Action Alternative will be considered and used as a baseline for comparison of alternatives. The No Action Alternative is to retain the U. S. Army forces in the Pacific in their current end strength and force structure. The No Action Alternative includes those stationing decisions which have already been made to include stationing actions directed by Base Realignment and Closure legislation in 2005, Army Global Defense Posture Realignment, and Army Modular Forces initiatives. The No Action Alternative is not a viable means for meeting the current and future strategic security and defense requirements of the nation.

The SPEIS will analyze the Proposed Action's impacts upon the natural, cultural, and man-made environments at those stationing locations which are capable of supporting the needs of the Army and its Soldiers and Families. Viable alternatives include those stationing locations that are able to meet Army unit requirements for training ranges and maneuver space, housing and office space, maintenance and vehicle parking, and Soldier and Family quality of life (e.g., schools, gyms, medical facilities). In addition, viable alternatives must meet the operational mission requirements of the Pacific Command (PACOM).

ADDRESSES: Submit comments to PublicComments@aec.apgea.army.mil.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Public Affairs Office, U.S. Army Environmental Command, Building E4460, 5179 Hoadley Road, Attention: IMAE-PA, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5401; telephone: (410) 436-2556; facsimile: (410) 436-1693. The Public Affairs Office is open during normal business hours Monday through Friday 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Eastern Time.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The global security environment is turbulent, unpredictable, and rapidly changing. It has placed considerable demands on the nation's military and highlighted the need for the Army to correct shortfalls in high-demand skills while reassessing its force capabilities. To meet the challenges of the 21st century security environment, the Army requires the growth and restructuring of its forces to support operations in the Pacific Theater to sustain the broad range of missions required to promote regional, national, and global stability.

Final decisions for the implementation of Army stationing actions within CONUS were published in the **Federal Register** in January 2008. Force structure requirements for U.S. Army Pacific (USARPAC) are still being evaluated. The SPEIS will consider the projected environmental and socioeconomic impacts of different stationing actions at locations capable of supporting operations in the Pacific Theater.

Alternatives for Army growth and force structure realignment to support operations in the Pacific Theater could involve the addition of new units, unit realignment from existing locations, and reconfiguration of the existing force structure in accordance with Army transformation. Adjustments to Army force structure could include changes in the numbers of CS/CSS Soldiers needed to support USARPAC operations with critical military skills such as military