

agreement on uranium from the Russian Federation on November 21, 2001 (66 FR 58433). On July 17, 2002, the Department received a letter from MINATOM withdrawing its request for the administrative review. This review has now been rescinded as a result of the withdrawal of the request for review by MINATOM, the only party which requested the review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 14, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

James Doyle or Catherine Bertrand, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0159 or (202) 482-3207, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), are to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (2001).

Background

On October 31, 2001, the Department received a timely request from MINATOM to conduct an administrative review of the Suspension Agreement ("Agreement") on uranium from the Russian Federation. On November 21, 2001, the Department initiated a review of the Agreement. See Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, 66 FR 58433 (November 21, 2001).

On April 22, 2002, the Department extended the time limits for the preliminary results of review by 120 days. See Notice of Extension of Time Limits of the Preliminary Results of Administrative Review of Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation of Uranium from the Russian Federation, as Amended, 67 FR 19554 (April 22, 2002). On July 17, 2002, MINATOM withdrew its request for the review.

Rescission of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations, the Department will allow a party that requests an administrative review to withdraw such request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the administrative review. Furthermore, the Department

may extend this time limit if the Secretary decides it is reasonable to do so, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). Given that we have received no submissions opposing MINATOM's request for withdrawal of the administrative review and the fact that MINATOM was the only party to request a review, we find it reasonable to extend the 90 days time period for filing a withdrawal request. Therefore, we are rescinding this review of the agreement suspending the antidumping duty investigation on uranium from the Russian Federation.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 351.213(d)(4) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: August 7, 2002.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02-20646 Filed 8-13-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

Pursuant to section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301), we invite comments on the question of whether instruments of equivalent scientific value, for the purposes for which the instruments shown below are intended to be used, are being manufactured in the United States.

Comments must comply with 15 CFR 301.5(a)(3) and (4) of the regulations and be filed within 20 days with the Statutory Import Programs Staff, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. in Suite 4100W, U.S. Department of Commerce, Franklin Court Building, 1099 14th Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Docket Number: 02-032. **Applicant:** Thomas Jefferson University, 1020 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107-5587. **Instrument:** Electron Microscope, Model Morgagni 268 Film version. **Manufacturer:** FEI Company, The Netherlands. **Intended Use:** The instrument is intended to be used in research on fixed rat brain tissue to identify interactions between endogenous opioids and corticotropin-releasing factor (CRF) that impact on a biogenic amine system which is involved in both stress and opioid actions, the locus coeruleus (LC)-

norepinephrine (NE) system.

Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs: July 16, 2002.

Docket Number: 02-033. **Applicant:** University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405. **Instrument:** High Speed CCD Camera, Model CPL MS1000. **Manufacturer:** Canadian Photonic Labs, Canada. **Intended Use:** The instrument is intended to be used to visualize high speed fluid flow in a variety of applications including: (1) Detachment of mechanisms of compound droplets from submerged needles and (2) visualize particulate flows in microchannels under videomicroscopy. The experimental objectives are to aid in the understanding of fundamental fluid mechanical mechanisms which cannot be observed with the human eye or normal video. The camera may be used for educational purposes in the following courses: (1) ME143 (Intro to Fluid Mechanics), (2) ME243 (Inviscid Flow), (3) ME249 (Computational Fluids Engineering) and (4) ME343 (Advanced Fluid Dynamics). **Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs:** July 30, 2002.

Docket Number: 02-034. **Applicant:** Alaska Department of Fish & Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, 333 Raspberry Road, Anchorage, AK 99518. **Instrument:** (Two) Digital Fish Measuring Boards. Model FMB IV/64/10. **Manufacturer:** Limnoterra Ltd., Canada. **Intended Use:** The instrument is intended to be used to monitor salmon and herring populations including measuring fish weight and lengths. Growth data will be collected from discreet herring and salmon runs when they enter their spawning grounds to understand the relationships between natural cycling, environmental pressures, and fish stock overall health more completely. **Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs:** July 30, 2002.

Docket Number: 02-035. **Applicant:** West Chester University of Pennsylvania, Purchasing Office, 201 Carter Drive, Suite 200, West Chester, PA 19383. **Instrument:** Electron Microscope, Model Tecnai 12 TWIN. **Manufacturer:** FEI Company, The Netherlands. **Intended Use:** The instrument is intended to be used in research programs including: (1) A taxonomic investigation of bryophytes, (2) the nuclear localization of the retinol metabolizing enzyme 9-cis retinol dehydrogenase within cancerous and normal mammary tissue and (3) the visualization of the early events that occur at the gap junctions of insect ovarian follicle cells. The instrument will also be used in the following

courses: (1) Research Techniques I (Comparative Microscopy, Internship, and Independent Study and (2) Field Techniques, Techniques in Mineralogy and Internship. *Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs: August 1, 2002.*

Gerald A. Zerdy,

Program Manager, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 02-20644 Filed 8-13-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-122-839]

Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Expedited Reviews: Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of countervailing duty expedited reviews.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting expedited reviews of the countervailing duty order on certain softwood lumber products from Canada for the period April 1, 2000 through March 31, 2001. This notice includes the preliminary results for 18 of the companies that are being reviewed under the expedited methodology. See "Notice of Initiation of Expedited Reviews" (67 FR 46955, July 17, 2002) (Notice of Initiation). For information on estimated net subsidies, please see the "Preliminary Results of Reviews" section of this notice. If the final results remain the same as these preliminary results of reviews, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to amend the cash deposit for each reviewed company as detailed in the "Preliminary Results of Reviews" section of this notice. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 14, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maria MacKay or Gayle Longest, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1775 or (202) 482-3338.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930, (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 351 (2002).

Background

On May 22, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** its amended final affirmative countervailing duty determination and countervailing duty order on certain softwood lumber products (subject merchandise) from Canada (67 FR 36068), as corrected (67 FR 37775, May 30, 2002). On July 17, 2002, the Department published the Notice of Initiation of Expedited Reviews. As indicated in that notice, the Department had received 100 timely requests for expedited review. Since the publication of that notice, we have accepted as timely nine other applications for expedited review (see, *Memorandum to the File* from Gayle Longest, Case Analyst, through Melissa Skinner, Director, Office VI, dated August 2, 2002, concerning Reconsideration of Timeliness of Certain Applications—Expedited Reviews of the Countervailing Duty Order on Softwood Lumber from Canada, filed in the Central Record Unit, Room B-099, Main Commerce Building (CRU)).

In the Notice of Initiation, we initiated expedited reviews on the 73 companies that we found to have filed complete and timely applications. We have provided the remaining 36 companies, which we found to have filed incomplete applications, the opportunity to perfect their filings.

As explained in the Notice of Initiation, we reached the conclusion that the most efficient way to conduct such a large number of reviews in an expedited manner, and at the same time respond to the concerns expressed by the interested parties, is to adopt a bifurcated and streamlined methodology. The comments we received support this view. Our methodology involves segregating the applicants into two groups. Group 1 consists of companies that obtain the majority of their wood (over 50 percent of their inputs) from the United States, the Maritime Provinces, Canadian private lands, and Canadian companies excluded from the order; as well as companies that source less than a

majority of their wood from these sources and do not have tenure. Group 2 includes companies that source less than a majority of their wood from these sources and have acquired Crown timber through their own tenure contracts. We reviewed the applications we received and assigned each of the 73 companies to one of the two groups. We found that 45 companies satisfied the requirements of Group 1 and 28 companies satisfied the requirements of Group 2. Within Group 1, 17 companies primarily used inputs from the United States, Canadian private forests, or the Maritime Provinces, and 25 primarily used Crown inputs but did not have tenure (for three companies, we need additional information to determine whether they will be in Group 1(a) or (b)).

In our review of the applications in Group 1, we noted that, in order to conduct our analysis, we required only minimal supplemental data for 24 of the 45 companies. The other Group 1 companies require additional information and more extensive analysis. Rather than delaying the process to provide all Group 1 companies the opportunity to submit the necessary information, we issued a short questionnaire to the 24 companies requiring only minimal information and set a short deadline for the response. Of the 24 companies, 18 were able to supply the information by the deadline. We have therefore been able to complete our preliminary analysis of those 18 companies, using the Group 1 methodology (see "Methodology" section below). We are continuing to process the other applications in Groups 1 and 2, and will be issuing additional questionnaires shortly.

Four of the companies to whom we sent questionnaires asked for extensions of time to submit their responses; we granted the extensions. In addition, two companies, Olav Haavalsrud Timber Company Limited and Western Commercial Millwork withdrew their requests for review. This notice includes the preliminary results of review for the following 18 companies:

Bois Daaquam Inc.
Bois Omega Ltée
City Lumber Sales & Services Limited
Herridge Sawmills Ltd.
Interbois, Inc.
J. A. Fontaine et fils Inc.
Jointfor (3207021 Canada Inc.)
Les Bois d'Oeuvre Beaudoin & Gauthier Inc.
Les Moulures Jacomau 2000, Inc.
Les Produits Forestiers Dube Inc.
Lonestar Lumber Inc.
Maibec Industries, Inc.