

antidumping duties occurred, and in the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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: January 17, 2006.

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

## APPENDIX

### I. General Issues

*Comment 1:* Freight to Unaffiliated Processors as Further Manufacturing

### II. Company Specific Issues

#### *Issues Specific to Ivaco*

*Comment 2:* Use of Level of Trade Adjustment for IRM's and Sivaco's U.S. Sales

*Comment 3:* Level of Trade Methodology Used for IRM's and Sivaco's U.S. Sales

*Comment 4:* Ministerial Error Allegations Specific to Ivaco

#### *Issues Specific to Ispat*

*Comment 5:* Cost Averaging Periods

*Comment 6:* CEP Profit

*Comment 7:* Negative Net-Prices for U.S. Sales

*Comment 8:* Treatment of Certain Sales as CEP Sales

*Comment 9:* Offsetting for Export Sales that Exceed Normal Value

*Comment 10:* Ministerial Error Allegations Specific to Ispat

[FR Doc. E6-823 Filed 1-23-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

(A-821-802)

#### **Extension of Time Limit for Sunset Review of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation**

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 24, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sally C. Gannon or Aishe Allen, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; (202) 482-0162 or (202) 482-0172, respectively.

#### **Extension of Time Limit for Sunset Review:**

On November 10, 2005, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") extended the time limit for the sunset review of the agreement suspending the antidumping investigation on uranium from the Russian Federation in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). See *Extension of Time Limit for Sunset Review of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation*, 70 FR 68397 (November 10, 2005) ("Notice of Extension"). The Department has now determined to conduct a full sunset review of this suspended investigation. See Memorandum from Sally C. Gannon to Ronald K. Lorentzen; "Sunset Review of Uranium from the Russian Federation: Adequacy of Domestic and Respondent Interested Party Responses to the Notice of Initiation and Decision to Conduct Full Sunset Review," dated January 17, 2006.

Pursuant to section 351.218(f) of the Department's regulations, the Department normally will issue its preliminary results in a full sunset review not later than 110 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation. However, as determined in *Notice of Extension*, the sunset review of the agreement suspending the antidumping investigation on uranium from the Russian Federation is extraordinarily complicated and requires additional time for the Department to complete its analysis. Therefore, the Department is extending the deadline for the preliminary results in this proceeding

by additional 30 days and, as a result, intends to issue the preliminary results of the full sunset review no later than February 17, 2006. The Department will issue its final results of the full sunset review on May 30, 2006, as specified in the *Notice of Extension*.

This notice is issued in accordance with sections 751(c)(5)(B) and (C)(v) of the Act.

Dated: January 17, 2006.

**Ronald K. Lorentzen,**  
*Director/Office of Policy.*

[FR Doc. E6-825 Filed 1-23-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-489-501]

#### **Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube from Turkey**

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

**SUMMARY:** On December 5, 2005, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") issued the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel pipe and tube ("welded pipe and tube") from Turkey.<sup>1</sup> The period of review is May 1, 2003, through April 30, 2004. Based on the correction of certain ministerial errors, we have changed the margins for the Borusan Group ("Borusan") and for the Yucel Group, which includes Cayirova Boru Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. and its affiliate, Yucel Boru Ithalat-Ihracat ve Pazarlama A.S. (collectively referred to as "Cayirova").

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 24, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christopher Hargett, George McMahon, or Jim Terpstra, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4161, (202) 482-1167 or (202) 482-3965, respectively.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

On December 12, 2005, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the final results of the

<sup>1</sup> See *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube from Turkey*, 70 FR 73447 (December 12, 2005).

administrative review of the antidumping duty order on welded pipe and tube from Turkey. We received timely allegations of ministerial errors from Borusan and Cayirova. In its comments dated December 9, 2005, Borusan alleged that the Department erred in that it did not include certain U.S. sales in the margin program. In its comments dated December 12, 2005, Cayirova alleged that the Department erred in the revised credit calculation in the home market (CREDITH). Petitioner did not comment on the ministerial errors alleged by respondents.<sup>2</sup> We agree with respondents that these errors are ministerial errors and have amended the final results to correct the errors referenced herein. For a full explanation of changes made by the Department, please see the Memorandum from Melissa G. Skinner to Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, *Ministerial Error Allegations Concerning the Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review on Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube from Turkey*, available in the Central Records Unit, room B099 of the main Department building.

#### Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of the correction of ministerial errors, the following weighted-average percentage margins exist for the period May 1, 2003, through April 30, 2004:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Margin (percent)	Amended Margin (percent)
Borusan .....	0.86	0.74
Cayirova .....	3.52	3.28

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with section 351.212(b)(1) of the Department's regulations, we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates by dividing the dumping margin found on the subject merchandise examined by the entered value of such merchandise. Where the importer-specific assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on that importer's entries of subject merchandise. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP within 15 days of publication of these amended final results of review.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all

shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these amended final results of administrative review, as provided by section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"): (1) For the companies named above, the cash deposit rate will be the rate listed above; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published in the most recent final results in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in these final results of review or in the most recent segment of the proceeding in which that manufacturer participated; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 14.74 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.

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

Dated: January 18, 2006.

**David M. Spooner,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*  
[FR Doc. E6-824 Filed 1-23-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Air Force

#### Notice of Intent To Perform an Environmental Assessment for Increased Depleted Uranium Use at Nevada Test and Training Range, Nevada

**AGENCY:** Department of the Air Force (AF), Air Combat Command (ACC).

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Increased Depleted Uranium (DU) Use at Nevada Test and Training Range (NTTR).

**Authority:** 42 United States Code §§ 4321-4347 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) parts 1500-1508.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Air Force is issuing this Notice of Intent (NOI) to announce that it is conducting an environmental assessment for the proposed action for increasing the annual number of depleted uranium (DU) rounds fired by A-10 aircraft using the 30-millimeter GAU-8 Gatling gun at the Nevada Test and Training Range (NTTR), Range 63, Target 63-10. This NOI describes the Air Force's proposed scoping process and identifies the Air Force's point of contact. Target 63-10 is the Air Force's only air-to-ground target for testing and training with DU rounds.

The proposed assessment will be prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321-4347), the Council on Environmental Quality NEPA regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), and Air Force's Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) (Air Force Instruction 32-7061 as promulgated at 32 CFR part 989) to determine the potential environmental effects of increasing DU rounds at the NTTR.

As part of the proposal, the Air Force will analyze three alternatives: A, B, and C. Alternative A (proposed action) would increase the annual use of 30-mm DU rounds in a combat mix (CM) from an existing 9,500 to 22,800 annually. CM contains armor-piercing incendiary (API) DU rounds mixed with high explosive incendiary (HEI) rounds in a 5 to 1 ratio. Alternative A would increase the annual use of DU rounds from 7,900 to 19,000 (and HEI rounds from 1,600 to 3,800) to provide the 422 Test and Evaluation Squadron (TES) and the 66 Weapons Squadron (WPS) graduates with sufficient DU rounds to accomplish essential testing and training requirements. Alternative B would enhance testing by increasing the use of CM to a total of 31,680 rounds (26,400 DU and 5,280 HEI) at Target 63-10. This alternative would meet test and training requirements and also allow additional testing by Tactics Development & Evaluation (TD&E) and Tactics Improvement Proposals (TIP). Alternative C (no-action) would reflect no change in current operations associated with Target 63-10 whereby 9,500 CM rounds (7,900 DU and 1,600 HEI) are deployed for test and training. This number (9,500) does not provide enough rounds for effective TES testing and WPS training.

**DATES:** The Air Force will conduct two scoping meetings to receive public input on alternatives, concerns, and issues to be addressed in the EA and to solicit public input concerning the scope of the proposed action and alternatives. The

<sup>2</sup> Petitioners are Allied Tube and Conduit Corporation, and Wheatland Tube Company.