

them in a visually intuitive graphical format.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: On Occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: Jasmeet Seehra, (202) 395-3123.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, (202) 482-0266, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at dHynek@doc.gov).

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to, OMB Desk Officer, Jasmeet Seehra, FAX Number (202) 395-5167, or Jasmeet_K_Seehra@omb.eop.gov.

Dated: January 24, 2011.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011-1798 Filed 1-26-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 1736]

Reorganization of Foreign-Trade Zone 104 Under Alternative Site Framework Savannah, GA

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, the Board adopted the alternative site framework (ASF) in December 2008 (74 FR 1170, 01/12/09; correction 74 FR 3987, 01/22/09; 75 FR 71069-71070, 11/22/10) as an option for the establishment or reorganization of general-purpose zones;

Whereas, the Savannah Airport Commission, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 104, submitted an application to the Board (FTZ Docket 51-2010, filed 8/26/2010) for authority to reorganize under the ASF with a service area of the Georgia counties of Bulloch, Bryan, Chatham, Effingham, Evans, Liberty, Long, and Screven in and adjacent to the Savannah Customs and Border Protection port of entry; FTZ 104's existing, new, and renumbered Sites 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16 would be categorized as magnet sites; and the grantee proposes three initial usage-driven sites (Sites 9, 10, and 13);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (75 FR 53637-53638, 9/1/2010) and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendation of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations are satisfied, and that the proposal is in the public interest;

Now, therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The application to reorganize FTZ 104 under the alternative site framework is approved, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28, to the Board's standard 2,000-acre activation limit for the overall general-purpose zone project, to a five-year ASF sunset provision for magnet sites that would terminate authority for Sites 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16 if not activated by January 31, 2016, and to a three-year ASF sunset provision for usage-driven sites that would terminate authority for Sites 9, 10, and 13 if no foreign-status merchandise is admitted for a *bona fide* customs purpose by January 31, 2014.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 12th day of January 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011-1767 Filed 1-26-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-834]

Purified Carboxymethylcellulose From Mexico: Final Results of the First Five-Year ("Sunset") Review of Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: On September 29, 2010, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published a notice of preliminary results of the full sunset review of the antidumping duty order on purified carboxymethylcellulose ("CMC") from Mexico pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). See *Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Mexico:*

Preliminary Results of the First Five-year ("Sunset") Review of Antidumping Duty Order, 75 FR 60084 (September 29, 2010) ("Preliminary Results"). We provided interested parties an opportunity to comment on our *Preliminary Results*. The Department did not receive comments from either domestic or respondent interested parties. As a result of this review, the Department continues to find that that revocation of the antidumping duty order with respect to CMC from Mexico would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of Review."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Dena Crossland or Angelica Mendoza, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3362 or (202) 482-3019, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 29, 2010, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of preliminary results of the full sunset review of antidumping duty order on CMC from Mexico, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. See *Preliminary Results*, 75 FR 60084. In our *Preliminary Results*, we found that revocation of the antidumping duty order with respect to CMC from Mexico would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping at the margins determined in the final determination of the original investigation. *Id.* We provided interested parties an opportunity to comment on our *Preliminary Results*. *Id.* We did not receive comments from either domestic or respondent interested parties.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by the order is all purified CMC, sometimes also referred to as purified sodium CMC, polyanionic cellulose, or cellulose gum, which is a white to off-white, non-toxic, odorless, biodegradable powder, comprising sodium CMC that has been refined and purified to a minimum assay of 90 percent. Purified CMC does not include unpurified or crude CMC, CMC Fluidized Polymer Suspensions, and CMC that is cross-linked through heat treatment. Purified CMC is CMC that has undergone one or more purification operations, which, at a minimum, reduce the remaining salt and other by-product portion of the product to less than ten percent. The

merchandise subject to the order is currently classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”) at subheading 3912.31.00.¹ This tariff classification is provided for convenience and Customs purposes; however, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Final Results of Review

We have made no changes to our *Preliminary Results*, 75 FR 60084. We continue to find that revocation of the antidumping duty order with respect to CMC from Mexico would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margins:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Weighted-average margin percentage
Quimica Amtex	12.61
All Others	12.61

In accordance with section 752(c)(3) of the Act, we will notify the International Trade Commission of the final results of this full sunset review.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (“APO”) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with section 351.305 of the Department’s regulations. Timely notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 20, 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2011-1797 Filed 1-26-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

¹ Although HTSUS number 3912.31.00.10 may be more specific to subject merchandise, it was not created until 2005. As such, we are relying on HTSUS number 3912.31.00 for purposes of this sunset review because in determining whether revocation of an order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, the Department considers the margins established in the investigation and/or reviews conducted during the sunset review period as well as the volume of imports for the periods before and after the issuance of the order. See section 752(c)(1) of the Act.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Proposed Methodology for Implementation of Section 772(c)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as Amended, In Certain Non-Market Economy Antidumping Proceedings; Request for Comment

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the “Department”) seeks public comment on its proposed methodological change to reduce the export price or constructed export price in certain non-market economy (“NME”) antidumping proceedings by the amount of an export tax, duty, or other charge, pursuant to section 772(c)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

DATES: To be assured of consideration, comments must be received no later than February 28, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Albert Hsu, Senior Economist, Office of Policy, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-4491.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Pursuant to section 772(c)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the “Act”), the Department is instructed to reduce the export price or constructed export price used in the dumping margin calculation by “the amount, if included in such price, of any export tax, duty, or other charge imposed by the exporting country on the exportation of the subject merchandise to the United States, other than an export tax, duty, or other charge described in section 771(6)(C) {of the Act}.” However, the Department’s administrative practice has been that it cannot apply section 772(c)(2)(B) in NME antidumping proceedings because pervasive government intervention in NMEs precluded proper valuation of taxes paid by NME respondents to NME governments. This practice originated in the less-than-fair-value investigations of pure magnesium and magnesium alloy from the Russian Federation, which the Department then considered to be an NME. See *Pure Magnesium and Alloy Magnesium from the Russian Federation*, 60 FR 16440 (Mar. 30, 1995) (final determination of sales at less than fair value) (“*Russian Magnesium*”) (Comment 10). In those investigations, the Department determined not to

reduce the NME respondents’ U.S. prices based upon an export tax paid to the NME government, the Russian Federation. *Id.*

The *Russian Magnesium* petitioners subsequently challenged this determination before the Court of International Trade (“CIT”), and the CIT granted the Department’s request for a voluntary remand to further explain its reasoning. See *Magnesium Corp. of America v. United States*, 20 CIT 1092, 1113-14 (1996) (“*Mag. Corp. I*”). In its remand results, the Department explained its “uniform approach” to transfers between NME governments and NME companies. The Department stated, in relevant part:

The {NME} is governed by a presumption of widespread intervention and influence in the economic activities of enterprises. An export tax charged for one purpose may be offset by government transfers provided for another purpose. * * *

To make a deduction for export taxes imposed by a NME government would unreasonably isolate one part of the web of transactions between government and producer. The Department’s uniform approach to intra-NME transfers can be seen in its policy regarding transfers (or “subsidies”) paid by a NME government to a NME producer. The Department—with the approval of the Court of Appeals—has declined to find such transfers to be subsidies given the nature of a {NME}. Such an economy is riddled with distortions, with the government influencing prices and cost structures, regulating investment, wages and private ownership, and allocating credit. Attempts to isolate individual government interventions in this setting—whether they be transfers from the government or from exporters to the government—make no sense.

See Remand Redetermination: *Magnesium Corp. of America, et al. v. United States*, at 6-8, dated Oct. 28, 1996 (“Remand Redetermination”) (available at: <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/tlei/index.html>).

The CIT upheld the Department’s remand results. See *Magnesium Corp. of America v. United States*, 20 CIT 1464, 1466 (1996) (“*Mag. Corp. II*”). The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit then affirmed the CIT’s decision, stating that it agreed with the reasoning put forward in the Department’s Remand Redetermination. See *Magnesium Corp. of America*, 166 F.3d 1364, 1370-71 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (“*Mag. Corp. III*”).

However, since *Mag. Corp. III*, the Department has changed its practice with respect to application of the countervailing duty (“CVD”) law to subsidized merchandise from China and Vietnam, which the Department continues to designate as NMEs. As explained in the countervailing duty investigations of Coated Free Sheet