

companies) involved in the transaction.<sup>17</sup>

For the companies which were not individually examined, we intend to assign an assessment rate based on the review-specific average rate, calculated as noted in the “Preliminary Results of Review” section, above. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by this review and for future deposits of estimated duties, where applicable.<sup>18</sup> Commerce intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP no earlier than 35 days after the date of publication of the final results of this review in the **Federal Register**. If a timely summons is filed at the U.S. Court of International Trade, the assessment instructions will direct CBP not to liquidate relevant entries until the time for parties to file a request for a statutory injunction has expired (*i.e.*, within 90 days of publication).

#### Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon the publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for each specific company listed above will be that established in the final results of this administrative review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent and, therefore, *de minimis* within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106(c)(1), in which case the cash deposit rate will be zero; (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 recently completed segment of this proceeding in which the producer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the investigation but the producer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recently completed segment of this proceeding for the producer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other producers or exporters will continue to be the all-others rate of 8.35 percent.<sup>19</sup> These cash deposit requirements, when

imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

#### Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping and/or countervailing duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Commerce’s presumption that reimbursement of antidumping and/or countervailing duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties, and/or an increase in the amount of antidumping duties by the amount of the countervailing duties.

#### Notification to Interested Parties

We are issuing and publishing these preliminary results in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4).

Dated: November 29, 2022.

**Lisa W. Wang,**

*Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

#### Appendix I

##### List of Topics Discussed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum

- I. Summary
- II. Background
- III. Scope of the Order
- IV. Partial Rescission of Review
- V. Companies Not Selected for Individual Examination
- VI. Discussion of the Methodology
- VII. Currency Conversion
- VIII. Recommendation

#### Appendix II

##### List of Companies Not Selected for Individual Examination

1. Apex Tubes Private Ltd.
2. Apurvi Industries
3. Arihant Tubes
4. Divine Tubes Pvt. Ltd.
5. Heavy Metal & Tubes
6. J.S.S. Steelitalia Ltd.
7. Linkwell Seamless Tubes Private Limited
8. Maxim Tubes Company Pvt. Ltd.
9. MBM Tubes Pvt. Ltd.
10. Mukat Tanks & Vessel Ltd.
11. Neotiss Ltd.
12. Prakash Steelage Ltd.
13. Quality Stainless Pvt. Ltd.
14. Raajratna Metal Industries Ltd.
15. Ratnadeep Metal & Tubes Ltd.
16. Remi Edelstahl Tubulars
17. Shubhlaxmi Metals & Tubes Private Limited
18. SLS Tubes Pvt. Ltd.
19. Steamline Industries Ltd.

[FR Doc. 2022–26449 Filed 12–5–22; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[RTID 0648–XC564]

#### Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Geophysical Surveys Related to Oil and Gas Activities in the Gulf of Mexico

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

**ACTION:** Notice of issuance of Letter of Authorization.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), as amended, its implementing regulations, and NMFS’ MMPA Regulations for Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Geophysical Surveys Related to Oil and Gas Activities in the Gulf of Mexico, notification is hereby given that a Letter of Authorization (LOA) has been issued to Woodside Energy, L.L.C. (Woodside) for the take of marine mammals incidental to geophysical survey activity in the Gulf of Mexico.

**DATES:** The LOA is effective from December 15, 2022, through June 15, 2023.

**ADDRESSES:** The LOA, LOA request, and supporting documentation are available online at: [www.fisheries.noaa.gov/action/incidental-take-authorization-oil-and-gas-industry-geophysical-survey-activity-gulf-mexico](http://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/action/incidental-take-authorization-oil-and-gas-industry-geophysical-survey-activity-gulf-mexico). In case of problems accessing these documents, please call the contact listed below (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ben Laws, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, (301) 427–8401.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

Sections 101(a)(5)(A) and (D) of the MMPA (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) direct the Secretary of Commerce to allow, upon request, the incidental, but not intentional, taking of small numbers of marine mammals by U.S. citizens who engage in a specified activity (other than commercial fishing) within a specified geographical region if certain findings are made and either regulations are issued or, if the taking is limited to harassment, a notice of a proposed authorization is provided to the public for review.

An authorization for incidental takings shall be granted if NMFS finds that the taking will have a negligible

<sup>17</sup> See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

<sup>18</sup> See section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act.

<sup>19</sup> See *Order*, 81 FR at 81063.

impact on the species or stock(s), will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stock(s) for subsistence uses (where relevant), and if the permissible methods of taking and requirements pertaining to the mitigation, monitoring and reporting of such takings are set forth. NMFS has defined “negligible impact” in 50 CFR 216.103 as an impact resulting from the specified activity that cannot be reasonably expected to, and is not reasonably likely to, adversely affect the species or stock through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival.

Except with respect to certain activities not pertinent here, the MMPA defines “harassment” as: any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance which (i) has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild (Level A harassment); or (ii) has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering (Level B harassment).

On January 19, 2021, we issued a final rule with regulations to govern the unintentional taking of marine mammals incidental to geophysical survey activities conducted by oil and gas industry operators, and those persons authorized to conduct activities on their behalf (collectively “industry operators”), in Federal waters of the U.S. Gulf of Mexico (GOM) over the course of 5 years (86 FR 5322, January 19, 2021). The rule was based on our findings that the total taking from the specified activities over the 5-year period will have a negligible impact on the affected species or stock(s) of marine mammals and will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of those species or stocks for subsistence uses. The rule became effective on April 19, 2021.

Our regulations at 50 CFR 217.180 *et seq.* allow for the issuance of LOAs to industry operators for the incidental take of marine mammals during geophysical survey activities and prescribe the permissible methods of taking and other means of effecting the least practicable adverse impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat (often referred to as mitigation), as well as requirements pertaining to the monitoring and reporting of such taking. Under 50 CFR 217.186(e), issuance of an LOA shall be based on a determination that the level of taking will be consistent with the findings made for the total taking allowable under these regulations and a determination that the amount of take

authorized under the LOA is of no more than small numbers.

### Summary of Request and Analysis

Woodside plans to conduct a Zero Offset Vertical Seismic Profile (VSP) survey within East Breaks Block 699. See Section H of Woodside’s application for a map. Woodside plans to use either a 6-element, 1,500 cubic inch (in<sup>3</sup>) airgun array or a 12-element, 2,400 in<sup>3</sup> airgun array. Please see Woodside’s application for additional detail.

Consistent with the preamble to the final rule, the survey effort proposed by Woodside in its LOA request was used to develop LOA-specific take estimates based on the acoustic exposure modeling results described in the preamble (86 FR 5322, 5398, January 19, 2021). In order to generate the appropriate take number for authorization, the following information was considered: (1) survey type; (2) location (by modeling zone);<sup>1</sup> (3) number of days; and (4) season.<sup>2</sup> The acoustic exposure modeling performed in support of the rule provides 24-hour exposure estimates for each species, specific to each modeled survey type in each zone and season.

No VSP surveys were included in the modeled survey types, and use of existing proxies (*i.e.*, 2D, 3D NAZ, 3D WAZ, Coil) is generally conservative for use in evaluation of these survey types. Summary descriptions of these modeled survey geometries are available in the preamble to the proposed rule (83 FR 29212, 29220, June 22, 2018). Coil was selected as the best available proxy survey type for Woodside’s VSP survey because the spatial coverage of the planned surveys is most similar to the coil survey pattern. For the planned survey, the seismic source array will be deployed in the following stationary form: Zero Offset VSP—deployed from a drilling rig at or near the borehole, with the seismic receivers (*i.e.*, geophones) deployed in the borehole on wireline at specified depth intervals. The coil survey pattern in the model was assumed to cover approximately 144 kilometers squared (km<sup>2</sup>) per day (compared with approximately 795 km<sup>2</sup>, 199 km<sup>2</sup>, and 845 km<sup>2</sup> per day for the 2D, 3D NAZ, and 3D WAZ survey patterns, respectively). Among the different parameters of the modeled survey patterns (*e.g.*, area covered, line spacing, number of sources, shot interval, total simulated pulses), NMFS

considers area covered per day to be most influential on daily modeled exposures exceeding Level B harassment criteria. Because Woodside’s planned survey is expected to cover no additional area as a stationary source, or up to three times the total depth of the well centered around the well head, the coil proxy is most representative of the effort planned by Woodside in terms of predicted Level B harassment.

In addition, all available acoustic exposure modeling results assume use of a 72-element, 8,000 in<sup>3</sup> array. Thus, estimated take numbers for this LOA are considered conservative due to the differences in both the airgun array (6 or 12 elements, 1,500 or 2,400 in<sup>3</sup>), and in daily survey area planned by Woodside (as mentioned above), as compared to those modeled for the rule.

The survey is planned to occur for a maximum of 2 days in Zone 6. The survey is planned to occur in winter, but may occur in either season. Therefore, the take estimates for each species are based on the season that has the greater value for the species (*i.e.*, winter or summer).

Additionally, for some species, take estimates based solely on the modeling yielded results that are not realistically likely to occur when considered in light of other relevant information available during the rulemaking process regarding marine mammal occurrence in the GOM. The approach used in the acoustic exposure modeling, in which seven modeling zones were defined over the U.S. GOM, necessarily averages fine-scale information about marine mammal distribution over the large area of each modeling zone. This can result in unrealistic projections regarding the likelihood of encountering particularly rare species and/or species not expected to occur outside particular habitats. Thus, although the modeling conducted for the rule is a natural starting point for estimating take, our rule acknowledged that other information could be considered (see, *e.g.*, 86 FR 5322, 5442 (January 19, 2021), discussing the need to provide flexibility and make efficient use of previous public and agency review of other information and identifying that additional public review is not necessary unless the model or inputs used differ substantively from those that were previously reviewed by NMFS and the public). For this survey, NMFS has other relevant information reviewed during the rulemaking that indicates use of the acoustic exposure modeling to generate a take estimate for certain marine mammal species produces results inconsistent with what is known regarding their occurrence in the GOM.

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of acoustic exposure modeling, the GOM was divided into seven zones. Zone 1 is not included in the geographic scope of the rule.

<sup>2</sup> For purposes of acoustic exposure modeling, seasons include Winter (December–March) and Summer (April–November).

Accordingly, we have adjusted the calculated take estimates for those species as described below.

NMFS' final rule described a "core habitat area" for Rice's whales (formerly known as GOM Bryde's whales)<sup>3</sup> located in the northeastern GOM in waters between 100–400 m depth along the continental shelf break (Rosel *et al.*, 2016). However, whaling records suggest that Rice's whales historically had a broader distribution within similar habitat parameters throughout the GOM (Reeves *et al.*, 2011; Rosel and Wilcox, 2014). In addition, habitat-based density modeling identified similar habitat (*i.e.*, approximately 100–400 m water depths along the continental shelf break) as being potential Rice's whale habitat (Roberts *et al.*, 2016), although the core habitat area contained approximately 92 percent of the predicted abundance of Rice's whales. See discussion provided at, *e.g.*, 83 FR 29228, 83 FR 29280 (June 22, 2018); 86 FR 5418 (January 19, 2021).

Although Rice's whales may occur outside of the core habitat area, we expect that any such occurrence would be limited to the narrow band of suitable habitat described above (*i.e.*, 100–400 m) and that, based on the few available records, these occurrences would be rare. Woodside's planned activities will occur in water depths of approximately 941 m in the northern GOM. Thus, NMFS does not expect there to be the reasonable potential for take of Rice's whale in association with this survey and, accordingly, does not authorize take of Rice's whale through this LOA.

Killer whales are the most rarely encountered species in the GOM, typically in deep waters of the central GOM (Roberts *et al.*, 2015; Maze-Foley and Mullin, 2006). As discussed in the final rule, the density models produced by Roberts *et al.* (2016) provide the best available scientific information regarding predicted density patterns of cetaceans in the U.S. GOM. The predictions represent the output of models derived from multi-year observations and associated environmental parameters that incorporate corrections for detection bias. However, in the case of killer whales, the model is informed by few data, as indicated by the coefficient of variation associated with the abundance predicted by the model (0.41, the second-highest of any GOM species

model; Roberts *et al.*, 2016). The model's authors noted the expected non-uniform distribution of this rarely-encountered species (as discussed above) and expressed that, due to the limited data available to inform the model, it "should be viewed cautiously" (Roberts *et al.*, 2015).

NOAA surveys in the GOM from 1992–2009 reported only 16 sightings of killer whales, with an additional 3 encounters during more recent survey effort from 2017–18 (Waring *et al.*, 2013; [www.boem.gov/gommapps](http://www.boem.gov/gommapps)). Two other species were also observed on less than 20 occasions during the 1992–2009 NOAA surveys (Fraser's dolphin and false killer whale).<sup>4</sup> However, observational data collected by protected species observers (PSOs) on industry geophysical survey vessels from 2002–2015 distinguish the killer whale in terms of rarity. During this period, killer whales were encountered on only 10 occasions, whereas the next most rarely encountered species (Fraser's dolphin) was recorded on 69 occasions (Barkaszi and Kelly, 2019). The false killer whale and pygmy killer whale were the next most rarely encountered species, with 110 records each. The killer whale was the species with the lowest detection frequency during each period over which PSO data were synthesized (2002–2008 and 2009–2015). This information qualitatively informed our rulemaking process, as discussed at 86 FR 5322, 5334 (January 19, 2021), and similarly informs our analysis here.

The rarity of encounter during seismic surveys is not likely to be the product of high bias on the probability of detection. Unlike certain cryptic species with high detection bias, such as *Kogia* spp. or beaked whales, or deep-diving species with high availability bias, such as beaked whales or sperm whales, killer whales are typically available for detection when present and are easily observed. Roberts *et al.* (2015) stated that availability is not a major factor affecting detectability of killer whales from shipboard surveys, as they are not a particularly long-diving species. Baird *et al.* (2005) reported that mean dive durations for 41 fish-eating killer whales for dives greater than or equal to 1 minute in duration was 2.3–2.4 minutes, and Hooker *et al.* (2012) reported that killer whales spent 78 percent of their time at depths between 0–10 m. Similarly, Kvadsheim *et al.* (2012) reported data from a study of four killer whales, noting that the whales

performed 20 times as many dives to 1–30 m depth than to deeper waters, with an average depth during those most common dives of approximately 3 m.

In summary, killer whales are the most rarely encountered species in the GOM and typically occur only in particularly deep water. While this information is reflected through the density model informing the acoustic exposure modeling results, there is relatively high uncertainty associated with the model for this species, and the acoustic exposure modeling applies mean distribution data over areas where the species is in fact less likely to occur. In addition, as noted above in relation to the general take estimation methodology, the assumed proxy source (72-element, 8,000-in<sup>3</sup> array) results in a significant overestimate of the actual potential for take to occur. NMFS' determination in reflection of the information discussed above, which informed the final rule, is that use of the generic acoustic exposure modeling results for killer whales would result in estimated take numbers that are inconsistent with the assumptions made in the rule regarding expected killer whale take (86 FR 5322, 5403, January 19, 2021).

In past authorizations, NMFS has often addressed situations involving the low likelihood of encountering a rare species such as killer whales in the GOM through authorization of take of a single group of average size (*i.e.*, representing a single potential encounter). See 83 FR 63268, December 7, 2018. See also 86 FR 29090, May 28, 2021; 85 FR 55645, September 9, 2020. For Woodside's survey, use of the exposure modeling produces an estimate of one killer whale exposure. Given the foregoing discussion, it is unlikely that any killer whales would be encountered during this 2-day survey, and accordingly, no take of killer whales is authorized through the Woodside LOA.

Based on the results of our analysis, NMFS has determined that the level of taking authorized through the LOA is consistent with the findings made for the total taking allowable under the regulations for the affected species or stocks of marine mammals. See Table 1 in this notice and Table 9 of the rule (86 FR 5322, January 19, 2021).

#### Small Numbers Determination

Under the GOM rule, NMFS may not authorize incidental take of marine mammals in an LOA if it will exceed "small numbers." In short, when an acceptable estimate of the individual marine mammals taken is available, if the estimated number of individual

<sup>3</sup> The final rule refers to the GOM Bryde's whale (*Balaenoptera edeni*). These whales were subsequently described as a new species, Rice's whale (*Balaenoptera ricei*) (Rosel *et al.*, 2021).

<sup>4</sup> However, note that these species have been observed over a greater range of water depths in the GOM than have killer whales.

animals taken is up to, but not greater than, one-third of the best available abundance estimate, NMFS will determine that the numbers of marine mammals taken of a species or stock are small. For more information please see NMFS' discussion of the MMPA's small numbers requirement provided in the final rule (86 FR 5322, 5438; January 19, 2021).

The take numbers for authorization, which are determined as described above, are used by NMFS in making the necessary small numbers

determinations, through comparison with the best available abundance estimates (see discussion at 86 FR 5322, 5391, January 19, 2021). For this comparison, NMFS' approach is to use the maximum theoretical population, determined through review of current stock assessment reports (SAR; [www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/marine-mammal-stock-assessments](http://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/marine-mammal-stock-assessments)) and model-predicted abundance information (<https://seamap.env.duke.edu/models/>

*Duke/GOM*). For the latter, for taxa where a density surface model could be produced, we use the maximum mean seasonal (*i.e.*, 3-month) abundance prediction for purposes of comparison as a precautionary smoothing of month-to-month fluctuations and in consideration of a corresponding lack of data in the literature regarding seasonal distribution of marine mammals in the GOM. Information supporting the small numbers determinations is provided in Table 1.

TABLE 1—TAKE ANALYSIS

Species	Authorized take <sup>1</sup>	Abundance <sup>2</sup>	Percent abundance
Rice's whale .....	0	51	n/a
Sperm whale .....	48	2,207	2.2
<i>Kogia</i> spp .....	<sup>3</sup> 11	4,373	0.2
Beaked whales .....	182	3,768	4.8
Rough-toothed dolphin .....	34	4,853	0.7
Bottlenose dolphin .....	101	176,108	0.1
Clymene dolphin .....	131	11,895	1.1
Atlantic spotted dolphin .....	42	74,785	0.1
Pantropical spotted dolphin .....	304	102,361	0.3
Spinner dolphin .....	7	25,114	0
Striped dolphin .....	34	5,229	0.6
Fraser's dolphin .....	12	1,665	0.7
Risso's dolphin .....	25	3,764	0.7
Melon-headed whale .....	65	7,003	0.9
Pygmy killer whale .....	15	2,126	0.7
False killer whale .....	25	3,204	0.8
Killer whale .....	0	267	n/a
Short-finned pilot whale .....	38	1,981	1.9

<sup>1</sup> Scalar ratios were not applied in this case due to brief survey duration.

<sup>2</sup> Best abundance estimate. For most taxa, the best abundance estimate for purposes of comparison with take estimates is considered here to be the model-predicted abundance (Roberts *et al.*, 2016). For those taxa where a density surface model predicting abundance by month was produced, the maximum mean seasonal abundance was used. For those taxa where abundance is not predicted by month, only mean annual abundance is available. For Rice's whale and the killer whale, the larger estimated SAR abundance estimate is used.

<sup>3</sup> Includes 1 take by Level A harassment and 10 takes by Level B harassment.

Based on the analysis contained herein of Woodside's proposed survey activity described in its LOA application and the anticipated take of marine mammals, NMFS finds that small numbers of marine mammals will be taken relative to the affected species or stock sizes and therefore is of no more than small numbers.

#### Authorization

NMFS has determined that the level of taking for this LOA request is consistent with the findings made for the total taking allowable under the incidental take regulations and that the amount of take authorized under the LOA is of no more than small numbers. Accordingly, we have issued an LOA to Woodside authorizing the take of marine mammals incidental to its geophysical survey activity, as described above.

Dated: December 1, 2022.

**Kimberly Damon-Randall,**

*Director, Office of Protected Resources,  
National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 2022-26485 Filed 12-5-22; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[Docket No.: ED-2022-SCC-0149]

#### Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request; Targeted Teacher Shortage Areas Data Collection

**AGENCY:** Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education (ED).

**ACTION:** Notice

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, the Department is proposing an extension without change of a currently

approved information collection request (ICR).

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before February 6, 2023.

**ADDRESSES:** To access and review all the documents related to the information collection listed in this notice, please use <http://www.regulations.gov> by searching the Docket ID number ED-2022-SCC-0149. Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov> by selecting the Docket ID number or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. If the regulations.gov site is not available to the public for any reason, the Department will temporarily accept comments at [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov). Please include the docket ID number and the title of the information collection request when requesting documents or submitting comments.