

fishing activities, continued recreational opportunities, protected land values, protected road and utility networks, and reduced maintenance costs for public infrastructure.

Wildlife habitat will not be disturbed during installation activities. No wetlands, wildlife habitat, fisheries, prime farmland, or cultural resources will be destroyed or threatened by this project. Some 11.3 acres of wetland and wetland type wildlife habitat will be preserved. Fishery habitats will also be maintained.

No endangered or threatened plant or animal species will be adversely affected by the project.

There are no wilderness areas in the watershed.

#### Alternatives

Seven alternative plans of action were considered in project planning. No significant adverse environmental impacts are anticipated from installation of the selected alternative. Also, the planned action is the most practical, complete, and acceptable means of protecting life and property of downstream residents.

#### Consultation—Public Participation

Original sponsoring organizations include the Gwinnett County Government, Gwinnett County Soil and Water Conservation District, and the Upper Ocmulgee River Resource Conservation and Development Council. At the initiation of the planning process, meetings were held with representatives of the original sponsoring organizations to ascertain their interest and concerns regarding the Yellow River Watershed. Gwinnett County agreed to serve as “lead sponsor” being responsible for leading the planning process with assistance from NRCS. As lead sponsor they also agreed to provide non-federal cost-share, property rights, operation and maintenance, and public participation during, and beyond, the planning process.

An Interdisciplinary Planning Team provided for the “technical” administration of this project. Technical administration includes tasks pursuant to the NRCS nine-step planning process, and planning procedures outlined in the NRCS-National Planning Procedures Handbook. Examples of tasks completed by the Planning Team include, but are not limited to, Preliminary Investigations, Hydrologic Analysis, Reservoir Sedimentation Surveys, Economic Analysis, Formulating and Evaluating Alternatives, and Writing the Watershed Plan—Environmental Assessment. Data collected from partner agencies, databases, landowners, and others throughout the entire planning process, were presented at the public meeting on April 14, 2005. Informal discussions amongst planning team members, partner agencies, and landowners were conducted throughout the entire planning period.

A Technical Advisory Group was developed to aid the Planning Team with the planning process. The following agencies were involved in developing this plan and provided representation on the Technical Advisory Group:

- Gwinnett County Government
- Gwinnett County Soil and Water Conservation Districts
- Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division [EPD], Safe Dams Program
- Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division [WRD], Game and Fisheries Section
- United States Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], Region IV
- USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS]
- USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service [F&WS]
- US Army Corps of Engineers [COE]

#### Public Participation

A public meeting was held on April 14, 2005 to explain the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Program and to scope resource problems, issues, and concerns of local residents associated with the Y-3 project area. Potential alternative solutions to bring Y-3 into compliance with current dam safety criteria were also presented. Through a voting process, eleven meeting participants heard summaries of planning accomplishments to date provided input on issues and concerns to be considered in the planning process, were made aware of results from the reservoir sedimentation survey, and identified which planning alternative [i.e. No Action, Decommission, Structural, Non-Structural] was most desirable.

#### Conclusion

The Environmental Assessment summarized above indicates that this Federal action will not cause significant adverse local, regional, or national impacts on the environment. Therefore, based on the above findings, I have determined that an environmental impact statement for the recommended plan of action on Yellow River Watershed Structure No. 3 is not required.

Dated: May 4, 2006.

**James E. Tillman, Sr.,  
State Conservationist.**

[FR Doc. E6-7306 Filed 5-12-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-16-P**

producers of the subject merchandise. The period of review (POR) is October 1, 2003, through September 30, 2004. 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:** May 15, 2006.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Tipten Troidl or Jolanta Lawska, at (202) 482-1767 or (202) 482-8362, respectively; AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14<sup>th</sup> Street & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On November 7, 2005, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the first 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*, 70 FR 67422 (November 7, 2005) (Preliminary Results). On December 7, 2005, petitioners<sup>1</sup> requested a hearing, and on December 7, 2005, Hysla Puebla, S.A. de C.V. (Hysla) also requested a hearing. On January 6, 2006, both petitioners and Hysla withdrew their requests for a hearing. No other interested parties requested a hearing.

We invited parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. On December 14, 2005, we received case briefs from Siderurgica Lazaro Cardenas Las Truchas S.A. de C.V. (SICARTSA), Hysla, and petitioners. All parties submitted rebuttal briefs on December 19, 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 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

<sup>1</sup> Gerdau Ameristeel US Inc., ISG Georgetown Inc., Keystone Consolidated Industries, Inc., and North Star Steel Texas, Inc.

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 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.<sup>2</sup>

#### Analysis of Comments Received

The issues raised in the case briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the 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 B-099 of the main Commerce building, and can also be accessed directly on the Web at [www.ita.doc.gov/frn](http://www.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: (1) Included our weighting of characteristic methodology used in prior segments which was omitted for the preliminary results; (2) made adjustments to the reported costs of direct materials (iron ore and steel scrap) from affiliated suppliers; (3) recalculated Hylsa's warranty expense ratio using a three-year history of U.S. warranty claims; (4) revised Hylsa's parent company's calculation of G&A expenses to include "corporate charges from affiliated parties;" (5) adjusted Hylsa's General & Administrative (G&A) expense ratio to account for "parent company profit sharing expenses;" (6) corrected a ministerial error in the calculation of net price for U.S. sales with billing adjustments. See May 8, 2006, Final Calculation Memorandum for Hylsa Puebla, S.A. de C.V.

Based on our analysis of comments received for SICARTSA and our finding, we have: (1) Included our weighting of characteristic methodology used in prior segments which was omitted for the preliminary results; (2) removed an improper adjustment to cost of manufacturing; (3) included the variable for debit notes in the programs; (4) corrected a syntax error in summing home-market credit expenses; (5) corrected an error in which we improperly excluded partially unpaid accounts receivables; (6) renamed a file of home-market selling expenses used

<sup>2</sup>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](http://hotdocs.usitc.gov/tariff_chapters_current/toc.html).

for constructed value which is imported from the comparison market program to the margin program; (7) removed an incorrect adjustment made to SICARTSA's general and administrative expense; (8) used the invoice date as the date of sale in the comparison market program; and (9) applied a per-unit assessment rate. *See* May 8, 2006, Final Calculation Memorandum for Siderurgica Lazaro Cardenas Las Truchas (SICARTSA).

Both Hylsa's and SICARTSA's adjustments are discussed in detail in the accompanying Wire Rod Decision Memorandum.

#### Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following weighted-average margins exist for the period October 01, 2003, through September 30, 2004:

Producer	Weighted-Average Margin (Percentage)
Hylsa .....	1.81
SICARTSA .....	1.26

#### Assessment

The Department will determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b). For Hylsa, the Department has calculated importer-specific duty assessment rates 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. For SICARTSA, the Department has calculated importer-specific assessment rates on a per-unit basis. Specifically, to calculate the assessment rate on a per-unit basis, the Department divided the total dumping margin for SICARTSA (calculated as the difference between normal value and export price) for each importer by the total quantity of subject merchandise sold to that importer during the POR. Where the assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess duties on all entries of subject merchandise by that importer. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP within 15 days of publication of these final results of review.

#### Cash Deposits

Furthermore, 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 SICARTSA and 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 20.11 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

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.

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: May 8, 2006.

**David M. Spooner,**  
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

#### Appendix

##### I. List of Comments:

###### *Hylsa Puebla S.A. (Hylsa)*

*Comment 1:* Treatment of Home-Market Sales of Redirected Merchandise

*Comment 2:* Recalculation of Hylsa's Warranty Expenses

*Comment 3:* Hylsa's Cost of Materials from Affiliated Suppliers - Major Input Rule

*Comment 4:* Treatment of Sales with Negative Dumping Margins ("Zeroing")

*Comment 5:* Managerial Labor Costs

*Comment 6:* Parent Company General and Administrative ("G&A") Expenses

*Comment 7:* Parent Company Employee Profit Sharing Expenses

*Comment 8:* Use of Monthly Costs for Profit Calculations

*Comment 9:* Hylsa's Home-Market Credit Expenses

*Comment 10:* Error in the Calculation of Net Price for U.S. Sales with Billing Adjustments

###### *Siderurgica Lazaro Cardenas las Truchas, S.A. de C.V. (SICARTSA)*

*Comment 11:* Major Input of Iron Ore and Ferrous Scrap

*Comment 12:* Credit Expense using U.S. Dollar Interest Rates

*Comment 13:* Assessment Rate

*Comment 14:* Adjustment to SICARTSA's G&A Expenses

*Comment 15:* Home-Market Discounts and Rebates

*Comment 16:* Home-Market Credit Expense

*Comment 17:* Treatment of Unpaid Accounts Receivable

*Comment 18:* Incorrect File Name

[FR Doc. E6-7360 Filed 5-12-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### International Trade Administration

**A-570-879**

#### **Polyvinyl Alcohol From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce ("the Department") published its preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyvinyl alcohol ("PVA") from the