State	Organization	Amount
OH	Adams County Hospital	$300,000
OK	Guymon School District	$359,439
OK	Miami Tribe Business Development Authority	$157,937
OK	Wapanucka Public School	$497,500
OR	St. Charles Medical Center Foundation	$431,302
PA	Lewistown Hospital	$500,000
SC	Orangeburg Consolidated School District Four	$500,000
SD	Horizon Health Care, Inc.	$202,720
TN	University of Tennessee at Martin	$499,999
TX	CHRISTUS St. Michael Health System	$500,000
TX	Educational Service Center Region XV	$462,271
TX	Frank Phillips College	$429,840
UT	University of Utah	$208,899
VT	Rutland Area Visiting Nurse Association & Hospice	$238,250
WA	Community Choice PHCO	$499,332
WI	Space Education Initiative, Inc.	$218,400
WV	Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College	$372,900

Dated: October 10, 2004.

James R. Newby,

Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service.

[FR Doc. 04–23202 Filed 10–15–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–507–501]

Certain In-Shell Pistachios From the Islamic Republic of Iran: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for preliminary results of countervailing duty administrative review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 18, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Darla Brown or Eric B. Greynolds, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

Time Limits

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order for which a review is requested. However, if it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of review within this time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary determination to a maximum of 365 days.

Background

On April 28, 2004, the Department initiated an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain in-shell pistachios from the Islamic Republic of Iran (Iran). *See* 69 FR 23170. The administrative review covers the period January 1, 2003, through December 31, 2003. The respondent in this administrative review is the Tehran Negah Nima Trading Company (Nima). The preliminary results are currently due no later than December 1, 2004.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review

Due to the fact that we have received several new subsidy allegations from petitioners and due to the complicated nature of this case, we find that it is not practicable for the Department to complete the preliminary results of the administrative review within the 245-day statutory time frame. Therefore, the Department is extending the time limits for completion of the preliminary results until March 31, 2005.

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

Dated: October 8, 2004.

Jeffrey A. May,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E4–2704 Filed 10–15–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–839]

Certain Polyester Staple Fiber From Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Determination To Revoke the Order in Part

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

SUMMARY: On June 10, 2004, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain polyester staple fiber from the Republic of Korea (''Korea''). The period of review is May 1, 2002, through April 30, 2003. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received and an examination of our calculations, we have made certain changes for the final results. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the three manufacturers/exporters are listed below in the ''Final Results of the Review'' section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 18, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew McAllister, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1174.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Since the publication of the preliminary results in this review (*see Certain Polyester Staple Fiber From Korea; Preliminary Results of*

Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Review, 69 FR 32497 (June 10, 2004) (''*Preliminary Results*'')), the following events have occurred.

We invited parties to comment on the preliminary results of the review. On June 10, 2004, we granted a request submitted by Saehan for an extension to file rebuttal briefs until July 19, 2004. On July 12, 2004, Arteva Specialties S.a.r.l., d/b/a KoSa and Wellman, Inc. (''the petitioners''), and the respondents Saehan Industries, Inc. (''Saehan'') and Huvis Corporation (''Huvis'') filed case briefs. On July 19, 2004, Huvis filed a rebuttal brief. A public hearing was held at the request of Saehan on August 3, 2004.

Scope of the Order

For the purposes of this order, the product covered is certain polyester staple fiber (''PSF''). PSF is defined as synthetic staple fibers, not carded, combed or otherwise processed for spinning, of polyesters measuring 3.3 decitex (3 denier, inclusive) or more in diameter. This merchandise is cut to lengths varying from one inch (25 mm) to five inches (127 mm). The merchandise subject to this order may be coated, usually with a silicon or other finish, or not coated. PSF is generally used as stuffing in sleeping bags, mattresses, ski jackets, comforters, cushions, pillows, and furniture. Merchandise of less than 3.3 decitex (less than 3 denier) currently classifiable under the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (''HTSUS'') at subheading 5503.20.00.20 is specifically excluded from this order. Also specifically excluded from this order are polyester staple fibers of 10 to 18 denier that are cut to lengths of 6 to 8 inches (fibers used in the manufacture of carpeting). In addition, low-melt PSF is excluded from this order. Low-melt PSF is defined as a bi-component fiber with an outer sheath that melts at a significantly lower temperature than its inner core.

The merchandise subject to this order is currently classifiable in the HTSUS at subheadings 5503.20.00.45 and 5503.20.00.65. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under order is dispositive.

Period of Review

The period of review (''POR'') is May 1, 2002, through April 30, 2003.

Verification

As stated in the *Preliminary Results* and provided in section 782(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), we verified information provided by Keon Baek Co. Ltd. (''Keon Baek'') using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturer's facilities, examination of relevant sales, cost and financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information.

Determination To Revoke

The Department ''may revoke, in whole or in part'' an antidumping duty order upon completion of a review under section 751 of the Act. While Congress has not specified the procedures that the Department must follow in revoking an order, the Department has developed a procedure for revocation that is described in 19 CFR 351.222. This regulation requires, *inter alia,* that a company requesting revocation must submit the following: (1) A certification that the company has sold the subject merchandise at not less than normal value (''NV'') in the current review period and that the company will not sell at less than NV in the future; (2) a certification that the company sold the subject merchandise in each of the three years forming the basis of the request in commercial quantities; and, (3) an agreement to reinstatement of the order if the Department concludes that the company, subsequent to the revocation, sold subject merchandise at less than NV. *See* 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1).

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1), Keon Baek requested revocation of the antidumping duty order as it pertains to that company. Consistent with the *Preliminary Results*, we continue to find that the request from Keon Baek meets all of the criteria under 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1).

According to 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2), upon receipt of such a request, the Department may revoke an order, in part, if it concludes that (1) the company in question has sold subject merchandise at not less than NV for a period of at least three consecutive years; (2) the continued application of the antidumping duty order is not otherwise necessary to offset dumping; and (3) the company has agreed to its immediate reinstatement in the order if the Department concludes that the company, subsequent to the revocation, sold subject merchandise at less than NV.

As explained in these final results, our calculations show that Keon Baek sold PSF at not less than NV during the current review period. In addition, Keon Baek sold PSF at not less than NV during the 1999–2001 review period (*i.e.*, Keon Baek's dumping margin was zero or *de minimis*). *See Polyester Staple Fiber From Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 63616 (October 15, 2002) (''*1999–2001 PSF AR Final*''), covering the period November 8, 1999, through April 30, 2001. As permitted by 19 CFR 351.222(d), we did not review the intervening review period.

Moreover, based on our examination of the sales data submitted by Keon Baek, we find that Keon Baek sold the subject merchandise in the United States in commercial quantities in each of the consecutive years cited by Keon Baek to support its request for revocation. *See* Memorandum to the File, ''Sales and Cost Verification Report—Keon Baek,'' dated May 26, 2004 (*''Keon Baek Verification Report''*), which is on file in the Department's Central Records Unit (''CRU'') in room B–099 of the main Department building.

Finally, we find that application of the antidumping order to Keon Baek is no longer warranted for the following reasons: (1) As noted above, the company had zero or *de minimis* margins for a period of at least three consecutive years; (2) the company has agreed to immediate reinstatement of the order if the Department finds that it has resumed making sales at less than NV; and (3) the continued application of the order is not otherwise necessary to offset dumping.

Therefore, we determine that Keon Baek qualifies for revocation of the order on PSF pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2) and that the order, with respect to subject merchandise produced and exported by Keon Baek, should be revoked. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.222(f)(3), we are terminating the suspension of liquidation for subject merchandise produced and exported by Keon Baek that was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after May 1, 2003, and will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (''CBP'') to refund with interest any cash deposits for such entries.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this review are addressed in the ''Issues and Decision Memorandum'' from Jeffrey A. May, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to James J. Jochum, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated October 8, 2004 (*Decision Memorandum*), which is hereby adopted by this notice. Attached to this notice as an appendix is a list of the issues which parties have raised and to which we have responded in the

Decision Memorandum. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in the Department's CRU. In addition, a complete version of the *Decision Memorandum* can be accessed directly on the Web at *http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html.* The paper copy and electronic version of the *Decision Memorandum* are identical in content.

Fair Value Comparisons

We calculated export price (''EP''), NV, and the cost of production (''COP'') based on the same methodologies used in the *Preliminary Results* with the following exceptions:

- For Saehan, we have adjusted the general and administrative expense ratio. *See* Memorandum from Julie H. Santoboni to File, ''Final Results Calculation Memorandum for Saehan Industries, Inc.,'' dated October 8, 2004 (*Saehan Calculation Memorandum*); *see also Decision Memorandum,* at Comments 1–3.
- For Saehan, we also corrected certain clerical errors made in the preliminary margin programs. *See Saehan Calculation Memorandum.*
- With respect to Huvis, for one of its home market customers, we have adjusted the credit period for open payment sales. *See* Memorandum from Team to File, ''Final Results Calculation Memorandum for Huvis Corporation,'' dated October 8, 2004; *see also Decision Memorandum,* at Comment 5.

Results of the COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(1)(C)(i) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given product were made at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in ''substantial quantities.'' Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the 12-month period were at prices less than the COP, we determined such sales to have been made in ''substantial quantities'' within an extended period of time in accordance with section 773(b)(1)(A) of the Act. In such cases, we also determined that such below-cost sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(1)(B) of the Act.

We found that, for certain specific products, more than 20 percent of Keon Baek's, Saehan's and Huvis' home market sales were at prices less than the COP and, thus, the below-cost sales were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities. In addition, these sales were made at prices that did not provide for the recovery of costs within a reasonable period of time. Therefore, we excluded these sales and used the remaining sales, if any, as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1).

Currency Conversions

We made currency conversions in accordance with section 773A of the Act in the same manner as in the *Preliminary Results.*

Final Results of the Review

We determine that the following percentage margins exist for the period May 1, 2002, through April 30, 2003:

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin percentage
Huvis Corporation	1.54
Keon Baek Co., Ltd	[1] 0.07
Saehan Industries, Inc	4.19

[1] *De minimis.*

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we have calculated exporter/importer (or customer)-specific assessment rates for merchandise subject to this review. To determine whether the duty assessment rates were *de minimis*, in accordance with the requirement set forth in 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we calculated importer (or customer)-specific *ad valorem* rates by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to that importer (or customer) and dividing this amount by the total value of the sales to that importer (or customer). Where an importer (or customer)-specific *ad valorem* rate was greater than *de minimis*, we calculated a per-unit assessment rate by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to that importer (or customer) and dividing this amount by the total quantity sold to that importer (or customer).

The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to the CBP within 15 days of publication of these final results of review.

Cash Deposit Rates

The following antidumping duty deposits will be required on all shipments of PSF from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, effective on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates listed above (except no cash deposit will be required if a company's weighted-average margin is *de minimis*, *i.e.*, less than 0.5 percent); (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, 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, the previous review, or the original 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) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous reviews, the cash deposit rate will be 7.91 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in *Certain Polyester Staple Fiber From the Republic of Korea: Notice of Amended Final Determination and Amended Order Pursuant to Final Court Decision,* 68 FR 74552 (December 24, 2003).

These cash deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification to Importers

This notice 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 Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

Notification Regarding APOs

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (''APOs'') 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.

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

Dated: October 8, 2004.

James J. Jochum,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix I—List of Comments in the Issues and Decision Memorandum

Comment 1: Inclusion of Indirect Selling Expenses in Saehan's G&A Calculation.

Comment 2: Inclusion of Non-Operating Gains and Losses in Saehan's G&A Calculation.

Comment 3: Calculation of Saehan's Net Interest Expense Ratio.

Comment 4: Clerical Errors in Saehan's Preliminary Margin Calculations.

Comment 5: Huvis' Reported Credit Expenses on Home Market Sales.

Comment 6: Huvis' Home Market Short-Term Interest Rate.

[FR Doc. E4–2705 Filed 10–15–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 101304D]

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Northeast (NE) Multispecies Framework Adjustment 40–A Permit Information Data Collection

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before December 17, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6625, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at *dHynek@doc.gov*).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Douglas W. Christel, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1 Blackburn Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930; telephone: 978–281–9141.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The proposed rule for Framework Adjustment 40–A (Framework 40–A) to the NE Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (FMP) was published in the **Federal Register** on September 14, 2004 (69 FR 55388). Framework 40–A was developed by the New England Fishery Management Council (Council) to provide additional opportunities for vessels in the fishery to target relatively healthy stocks of groundfish in order to mitigate the economic and social impacts resulting from the effort reductions promulgated by Amendment 13 to the FMP (69 FR 22906, April 27, 2004), and to harvest groundfish stocks at levels that approach optimum yield. Framework 40–A proposes to create three programs to allow vessels to use Category B Days-at-Sea (DAS) (both Regular and Reserve) to target healthy stocks: (1) Regular B DAS Pilot Program; (2) Closed Area (CA) I Hook Gear Haddock Special Access Program (SAP); and (3) Eastern U.S./Canada Haddock SAP Pilot Program.

In addition, Framework 40–A proposes to relieve an Amendment 13 restriction that currently prohibits vessels from fishing both in the Western U.S./Canada Area, and outside that area on the same trip.

The information collection for the provisions within Framework 40–A was approved by the Office of Management and Budget in an emergency clearance on September 22, 2004. This information collection submission included automated vessel monitoring system (VMS) polling of vessel position; observer notifications; area and DAS category declarations via VMS; when fishing on a Category B DAS, declaration of a DAS category ''flip'' to a Category A DAS when a vessel exceeds the possession limit; and a declaration to participate in the Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP.

II. Method of Collection

Automated VMS polling of vessel position would be required of all vessels intending to participate in the programs proposed under Framework 40–A. The vessel operator would not be required to submit this information manually. Vessel owners would be charged a monthly operational fee for VMS usage. The area to be fished and the category of DAS to be used would be required to be declared prior to leaving port on a trip in which a vessel intends to participate in one of the programs proposed in Framework 40–A. A DAS category ''flip'' would be required if a vessel exceeds the possession limit specified for several species of concern when fishing on a Category B DAS. Reporting this information via VMS is required to monitor: (1) DAS usage; (2) compliance with the provisions of the specific programs proposed in Framework 40–A; and (3) compliance with the closed area regulations.

Notification of the intent to participate in any of the programs proposed under Framework 40–A prior to each trip, as well as the declaration of a vessel's intent to participate in the Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP, would occur via a telephone call to the contracting company tasked with providing observer coverage. This information is required to determine the necessary observer coverage for these programs.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0648–0501.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Business or other for profit organizations; and individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 997.

Estimated Time Per Response: Each automated VMS positional poll requires an estimated 5 seconds per response. Declarations of the area to be fished, DAS to be used, and DAS ''flips'' via VMS would take approximately 5 minutes per declaration. The observer notification prior to each trip is estimated to take 2 minutes per notification. Finally, declaring a vessel's intent to participate in the Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP is expected to take approximately 2 minutes per declaration.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: The information collection submission for Framework 40–A included revisions to previously approved information collections for Amendment 13. As a result, the estimated total annual burden hours for the provisions contained within Framework 40–A information collection submission amount to a reduction of 2,094 hours from previous submissions.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $1,181,264.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the