On May 1, 2019, the Department of Commerce (Commerce) published the Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination on glycine from the People’s Republic of China (China).¹ On June 21, 2019, in accordance with section 706(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Commerce published the Countervailing Duty Orders on glycine from China.² In both the Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and the Countervailing Duty Orders, Commerce made a typographical error with respect to the spelling of the company name of Simagchem Corp., a mandatory respondent subject to the countervailing duty investigation on glycine from China. Specifically, Commerce misspelled the company name as “Sigmachem Corp.” in the subsidy rate tables of both the Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and the Countervailing Duty Orders. The correct spelling of the company name is “Simagchem Corp.” As a result, we hereby correct the Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and the Countervailing Duty Orders.

Correction

Commerce has corrected the spelling of the company name of Simagchem Corp. in the subsidy rate tables of the Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and the Countervailing Duty Order. The estimated subsidy rates remain unchanged. The corrected subsidy rate table is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exporter/producer</th>
<th>Subsidy rate (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC Chemicals Limited</td>
<td>144.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simagchem Corp.</td>
<td>144.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>144.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This correction to the Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and the Countervailing Duty Orders is issued and published in accordance with sections 777(i)(1) and 706(a) of the Act.

Dated: July 17, 2019.

Jeffrey I. Kessler,
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

nation’s coastal ecosystems. Almost every state now experiences some kind of HAB event, and the number of hypoxic water bodies in the United States has increased over the last century. Recent economic analyses show effects costing hundreds of millions of dollars. Even just one major HAB or hypoxia event can incur tens of millions of dollars to local coastal economies, indicating that the nationwide economic impacts are likely much larger.


Following such a determination, federal officials may “make sums available to the affected State or local government for the purposes of assessing and mitigating the detrimental environmental, economic, subsistence use, and public health effects of the event of national significance.” Funds would be subject to the availability of appropriations. This notice focuses only on the authority granted to NOAA and provides interested parties with an opportunity to provide information early in the policy development process for determining HAB and hypoxia events of national significance in marine or coastal waters. Factors to be considered in making a determination include the toxicity of the HAB, severity of hypoxia, potential for spread, economic impact, relative size in relation to the past five occurrences, and the geographic scope. NOAA is accepting comments to inform the development of guidance for assessing these considerations and whether additional factors should be considered. The determination process optimally will include quantitative and qualitative means of assessment. In particular, NOAA is interested in the following topics:

- The approach that NOAA should use to quantify and qualify the factors identified in the reauthorization of HABHRCRCA to determine an event of national significance.
- How NOAA should define and weigh the following statutory parameters:
  - Toxicity of the HAB and severity of hypoxia;
  - Economic impact;
  - Relative size in relation to the past five occurrences of HAB or hypoxia events; that occur on a recurrent or annual basis;
  - Geographic scope, including the potential to spread and affect either a single jurisdiction or multiple municipalities, states, or countries.
- Based on the statutory parameters above, how should NOAA define significant detrimental environmental, economic, subsistence use, and public health effects and what thresholds should be considered in making a determination.
- Whether NOAA should consider developing additional criteria, and, if so, how NOAA should quantify or qualify these additional criteria. For example:
  - How NOAA should define an hypoxia event, and whether hypoxia should be defined relative to a set value or specific to an organism, a place, or time;
  - Whether NOAA should consider inclusion of the duration of an event;
  - Whether NOAA should consider the level of public concern and, if so, how to measure that.
- For the parameters described above, the information that a state should provide when requesting a determination and/or funds.
- For the purposes of a determination, and possible assessments and/or mitigation funds, how NOAA should define (A) the start and end of an event; and (B) the geographic extent of the event. Relative to these definitions, whether and how NOAA should establish the point at which states can/may make a funding request for assessment and mitigation assistance.
- For an event that has affected more than one state or shows the potential to do so in the case of an on-going event, whether NOAA should:
  - Make a single determination for an event applicable to all states affected at the time of a determination and any future states affected by the event via geographic expansion, movement, or intensification of the event;
  - Limit determinations to the area requested by a State based on the then-current location and geographic extent of the event. This alternative could result in multiple state-by-state determinations for a single event.
  - How to define subsistence use.
  - The definition of the 50% federal/state match, and what contributions may be considered.

To ensure clarity, NOAA requests separate comments for HAB and hypoxia events as it is likely that the factors for each will be considered differently. For more details and background, please refer to this site: https://coastalscience.noaa.gov/.

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.

Steven Thur,
Director, National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
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Notice of Availability of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Open Ocean Trustee Implementation Group Draft Restoration Plan 2 and Environmental Assessment: Fish, Sea Turtles, Marine Mammals, and Mesophotic and Deep Benthic Communities; Reopening of Public Comment Period

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comments; reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: We are reopening the public comment period on our Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Open Ocean Trustee Implementation Group Draft Restoration Plan 2/Environmental Assessment: Fish, Sea Turtles, Marine Mammals, and Mesophotic and Deep Benthic Communities (RP/EA). We opened the original comment period via a May 15, 2019, Federal Register notice. That comment period was extended on July 1 and formally closed on July 15, 2019. Due to extenuating weather conditions associated with the recent Hurricane Barry, this notice reopens the comment period through August 2, 2019. Comments submitted previously in response to either of these two Federal Register notices, including any comments submitted after July 15, and before the issuance of this notice do not need to be resubmitted.
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