DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[FR Doc. 2015–28280 Filed 11–4–15; 8:45 am]

Application for Additional Production Authority: The Coleman Company, Inc., Subzone 119I, (Textile-Based Personal Flotation Devices); Notice of Public Hearing and Extension of Comment Period

At the request of the applicant, a public hearing will be held on the application for additional production authority submitted by The Coleman Company, Inc., for activity within Subzone 119I in Sauk Rapids, Minnesota (80 FR 49986, 8–18–2015). The Commerce examiner will hold the public hearing on December 3, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., at the U.S. Department of Commerce, Hoover Building, Room 3407, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230. Interested parties should indicate their intent to participate in the hearing and provide a summary of their remarks (submitted to ftz@trade.gov or the address indicated below) no later than November 30, 2015.

The comment period for the case referenced above will be extended through January 4, 2016. Rebuttal comments may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period, until January 19, 2016. Submissions (signed original and one electronic copy) shall be addressed to the FTZ Board’s Executive Secretary at: Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 21013, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002.

For further information, contact Pierre Duy at Pierre.Duy@trade.gov or (202) 482–1378.

Dated: October 30, 2015.

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.
[FR Doc. 2015–28280 Filed 11–4–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Materials Technical Advisory Committee; Notice of Open Meeting

The Materials Technical Advisory Committee will meet on November 19, 2015, 10:00 a.m., Herbert C. Hoover Building, Room 3884, 14th Street between Constitution & Pennsylvania Avenues NW., Washington, DC. The Committee advises the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration with respect to technical questions that affect the level of export controls applicable to materials and related technology.

Notice of Open Meeting

The Transportation and Related Equipment Technical Advisory Committee will meet on November 18, 2015, 9:30 a.m., in the Herbert C. Hoover Building, Room 3884, 14th Street between Constitution & Pennsylvania Avenues NW., Washington, DC. The Committee advises the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration with respect to technical questions that affect the level of export controls applicable to transportation and related equipment or technology.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Transportation and Related Equipment; Technical Advisory Committee

Notice of Open Meeting

The Transportation and Related Equipment Technical Advisory Committee will meet on November 18, 2015, 9:30 a.m., in the Herbert C. Hoover Building, Room 3884, 14th Street between Constitution & Pennsylvania Avenues NW., Washington, DC. The Committee advises the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration with respect to technical questions that affect the level of export controls applicable to transportation and related equipment or technology.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[FR Doc. 2015–28199 Filed 11–4–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–JT–P

Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Investigations of Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products From India, Italy, the People’s Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan: Preliminary Determinations of Critical Circumstances

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On June 3, 2015, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received antidumping duty (AD) and countervailing duty (CVD) petitions concerning imports of corrosion-resistant steel products (CORE) from India, Italy, the People’s Republic of China (PRC), the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan.1 On July 23,
subject merchandise over a relatively short period. Section 19 CFR 351.206 provides that imports must increase by at least 15 percent during the “relatively short period” to be considered “massive” and defines a “relatively short period” as normally being the period beginning on the date the proceeding begins (i.e., the date the petition is filed) and ending at least three months later. The regulations also provide, however, that, if the Department finds that importers, or exporters or producers, had reason to believe, at some time prior to the beginning of the proceeding, that a proceeding was likely, the Department may consider a period of not less than three months from that earlier time.

Alleged Countervailable Subsidies Are Inconsistent With the SCM Agreement

To determine whether an alleged countervailable subsidy is inconsistent with the SCM Agreement, in accordance with section 733(f)(1)(A) of the Act, the Department considered the evidence currently on the record of the five CVD investigations. Specifically, as determined in our initiation checklists, the following subsidy programs, alleged in the Petitions and supported by information reasonably available to Petitioners, appear to be either export contingent or contingent upon the use of domestic goods over imported goods, which would render them inconsistent with the SCM Agreement.

• India: Four export-contingent duty exemption/remission schemes, four duty and tax exemption programs for “Export Oriented Units,” the Export Promotion of Capital Goods Scheme, Pre-Shipment and Post-Shipment Export Financing, Market Development Assistance Scheme, Market Access Initiative, Focus Product Scheme, Status Certificate Program, five duty and tax exemption programs for special economic zones, Incremental Exports Incentivisation Scheme, and three duty and tax exemption programs provided by the state of Gujarat for special economic zones.

• Indonesia: Several export-contingent preferential financial products provided by the Special Section for Export Credit Insurance.


• Korea: Several export-contingent preferential financial products and services provided by the Korean Export-Import Bank Countervailable Subsidy Programs, preferential loans from the Korea Development Bank and Industrial Base Fund, export financing provided by the Korea Trade Insurance Corporation, and Grants for International Development Activities.

Therefore, the Department preliminarily determines that there are alleged subsidies in each CVD investigation inconsistent with the SCM agreement.

History of Dumping and Material Injury/Knowledge of Sales Below Fair Value and Material Injury

In order to determine whether there is a history of dumping pursuant to section 733(e)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, the Department generally considers current or previous AD orders on subject merchandise from the country in question in the United States and current orders imposed by other countries with regard to imports of the same merchandise. The Department has previously issued an AD order on
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People’s Republic of China (PRC), the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan, dated June 3, 2015 (the Petitions). The petitioners for these investigations are United States Steel Corporation, Nucor Corporation, ArcelorMittal USA, AK Steel Corporation, Steel Dynamics, Inc., and California Steel Industries, Inc. (Petitioners).

2 See Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products from India, Italy, the People’s Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan: Critical Circumstances Allegations, July 23, 2015 (Critical Circumstances Allegation).

2 See India CVD Initiation Checklist, June 23, 2015, at 7–9.

3 See 19 CFR 351.206(j).
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from Korea,\textsuperscript{39} based on nearly identical HTS categories, as well as AD orders on carbon steel flat products from the PRC.\textsuperscript{31} Moreover, there are current AD orders imposed by other World Trade Organization members against certain coated steel products (i.e., carbon steel flat products either clad, plated or coated with zinc, aluminum, or nickel) from Korea, the PRC, and Taiwan.\textsuperscript{32}

Certain HTS numbers subject to these orders overlap with HTS numbers listed under our current CORE scope. Therefore, there is a history of dumping of subject merchandise exported from Korea, the PRC, and Taiwan.

To determine whether importers knew or should have known that exporters were selling at less than fair value, we typically consider the magnitude of dumping margins, including margins alleged in petitions.\textsuperscript{43} The Department has found margins of 15 to 25 percent (depending on whether sales are export price sales or constructed export price sales) to be sufficient for this purpose.\textsuperscript{44} Dumping margins alleged in all five AD petitions are significantly above the 15 to 25 percent threshold: 71.09 percent (India),\textsuperscript{35} 123.76 percent (Italy),\textsuperscript{36} 80.06 percent (Korea),\textsuperscript{37} 120.20 percent (the PRC),\textsuperscript{38} and 84.40 percent (Taiwan).\textsuperscript{39}

Therefore, on that basis, we preliminarily conclude importers knew or should have known exporters in all five countries were selling at less than fair value.

To determine whether importers knew or should have known that there was likely to be material injury, we typically consider the preliminary injury determinations of the International Trade Commission (ITC).\textsuperscript{40}

If the ITC finds material injury (as opposed to the threat of injury), we normally find that the ITC’s determination provided importers with sufficient knowledge of injury. Where, as in this case,\textsuperscript{41} the ITC finds only threat of material injury, the Department may consider additional sources of information, such as trade and price statistics or press reports. Petitioners placed several press reports on the record indicating injury. For example: U.S. steel companies are struggling against a combination of lower oil prices, oversupply and excessive imports fed by a strong dollar. Those headwinds have become a perfect storm that could lead to more idled plants and layoffs, and spur a major international trade case against China, which steel makers accuse of undercutting the market with artificially low-priced product. U.S. Steel executives have expressed the great concern about cheap imports. On Thursday, CEO and President Mario Longhi testified before the Congressional Steel Caucus and warned of long-term damage to domestic steel makers from what the industry says is illegal dumping by foreign companies. China’s state-subsidized industry continue to pump out steel, even as demand slows at home. That has led to surging exports, particularly to the United States.\textsuperscript{42}

In addition, the Department has relied on massive imports and high dumping margins as factors indicating importers knew or should have known that there was likely to be material injury.\textsuperscript{43} As noted above, dumping margins alleged in the five AD petitions range from 71.09 percent to 123.76 percent.

As discussed below, we have determined imports were massive for certain producers/exporters shipping from Italy, Korea, the PRC, and Taiwan. Therefore, we preliminarily conclude importers knew or should have known that there was likely to be material injury as a result of sales sold at less than fair value, exported from all five countries.

### Massive Imports

In determining whether there are “massive imports” over a “relatively short period,” pursuant to sections 703(e)(1)(B) and 733(e)(1)(B) of the Act, the Department normally compares the import volumes of the subject merchandise for at least three months immediately preceding the filing of the petition (i.e., the “base period”) to a comparable period of at least three months following the filing of the petition (i.e., the “comparison period”). Imports normally will be considered massive when imports during the comparison period have increased by 15 percent or more compared to imports during the base period.

Based on evidence provided by Petitioners, the Department finds that pursuant to 19 CFR 351.206(l), importers, exporters or producers had reason to believe, at some time prior to the filing of the petition, that a proceeding was likely. Specifically, the Department concludes that the factual information provided by Petitioners indicates that by March 2015, importers, exporters or producers had reason to believe that proceedings were likely. Among the documents Petitioners provided to support their claim of so-called “early knowledge,” the Department finds the following particularly relevant:

- On March 10, 2015, Steel Market Update acknowledged and responded to an influx of “recent” inquiries from...
importers of cold-rolled steel and CORE steel products “asking questions about the potential for a trade case or antidumping filing by the domestic mills against foreign steel imports.”

- On March 26, 2015, American Metal Market issued a press release stating that nearly 70 percent of industry participants expected cold-rolled and CORE steel cases to be filed in 2015.

- On March 27, 2015, the Pittsburgh Tribune published an article stating that “domestic steel makers are beginning to take their case to Washington.” One expert quoted in the article concluded that a trade case appeared “inevitable.”

- On March 30, 2015, Barron’s published an article that U.S. steel industry officials had “no intention of delay” and would pursue trade remedies as soon as possible.

The article states that the U.S. industry would not pursue safeguard actions, but instead would pursue AD/CVD remedies focused on hot-rolled coil, cold-rolled coil, and CORE steel products.

While additional information presented in Petitioners’ exhibits indicate rumors of trade cases had been circulating as far back as 2014, the above statements indicate that by March 2015, these rumors had turned to expectations among steel importers, exporters, and producers that forthcoming petitions were inevitable. Thus, in order to determine whether there has been a massive surge in imports for each cooperating mandatory respondent, the Department compared the total volume of shipments from March 2015 through September 2015 (all months for which data was available) with the preceding seven-month period of August 2014 through February 2015. For “all others,” the Department compared Global Trade Atlas (GTA) data for the period March through August (the last month for which GTA data is currently available) with the proceeding six-month period of September 2014 through February 2015. We first subtracted shipments reported by the cooperating mandatory respondents from the GTA data. For non-cooperating mandatory respondents (i.e., those mandatory respondents that did not respond to our critical circumstances questionnaire or who otherwise indicated their unwillingness to participate in the investigations), we determined, on the basis of adverse facts available, that there has been a massive surge in imports. Accordingly, we preliminarily determined the following producers/exporters had massive surges in imports:

- Italy (C–475–833): ILVA S.p.A. (ILVA)
- Korea (A–580–878): Hyundai Steel Company (Hyundai); “All Others”
- Korea (C–580–879): “All Others”
- PRC (A–570–026): the PRC-wide entity; Hebei Iron & Steel Co., Ltd. (Tangshan Branch) (Tangshan); Baoshan Iron & Steel Co., Ltd. (Baoshan)
- PRC (C–570–027): Angang Group Hong Kong Company Ltd. (Angang); Dufersco S.A. (Dufersco); Handan Iron & Steel Group (Handan); Changshu Everbright Material Technology (Everbright); Baoshan
- Taiwan (A–583–856 and C–583–857): “All Others”

**Conclusion**

Based on the criteria and findings discussed above, we preliminarily determine that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of cold-rolled steel products shipped by certain producers/exporters. Our findings are summarized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Affirmative preliminary critical circumstances determination</th>
<th>Negative preliminary critical circumstances determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>A–570–026</td>
<td>the PRC-wide entity; Tangshan; Baoshan</td>
<td>Yieh Phui (China) Technomaterial Co., Ltd. (YPC); All Other producers/exporters entitled to a separate rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>C–570–027</td>
<td>Angang, Dufersco, Handan, Everbright, Baoshan Hyundai; All Other producers/exporters</td>
<td>YPC; All Other producers/exporters. Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd. (Dongbu); Dongbu Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A–580–878</td>
<td>All Other producers/exporters</td>
<td>Yieh Phui Enterprises Co., Ltd. (Yieh Phui); Prosperity Tiek Enterprises Co., Ltd. (Prosperity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C–580–879</td>
<td>All Other producers/exporters</td>
<td>Yieh Phui; Prosperity. Uttam Galva Steels, Ltd. (Uttam); JSW Steel Limited (JSW); All Other producers/exporters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>A–583–856</td>
<td>All Other producers/exporters</td>
<td>Uttam; JSW; All Other producers/exporters. Acciaieria Arvedi S.p.A. (Arvedi); Marcegaglia S.p.A. (Marcegaglia); All Other producers/exporters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>A–533–863</td>
<td>no companies</td>
<td>Arvedi; Marcegaglia; All Other producers/exporters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>C–533–864</td>
<td>no companies</td>
<td>Arvedi; Marcegaglia; All Other producers/exporters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A–475–832</td>
<td>ILVA</td>
<td>Arvedi; Marcegaglia; All Other producers/exporters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

45 See Critical Circumstances Allegation at Exhibit 7.
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51 See Section 776 of the Act.
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Final Critical Circumstances Determinations

We will issue final determinations concerning critical circumstances when we issue our final subsidy and less-than-fair-value determinations. All interested parties will have the opportunity to address these determinations in case briefs to be submitted after completion of the preliminary subsidies and less than fair value determinations.

ITC Notification

In accordance with sections 703(f) and 733(f) of the Act, we will notify the ITC of our determinations.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with sections 703(e)(2), because we have preliminarily found that critical circumstances exist with regard to imports exported by certain producers and exporters, if we make an affirmative preliminary determination that counteravailable subsidies have been provided to these same producers/exporters at above de minimis rates,53 we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to suspend liquidation of all entries of subject merchandise from these producers/exporters that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date that is 90 days prior to the effective date of “provisional measures” (e.g., the date of publication in the Federal Register of the notice of an affirmative preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value at above de minimis rates). At such time, we will also instruct CBP to require a cash deposit equal to the estimated preliminary dumping margins reflected in the preliminary determination published in the Federal Register. This suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.224(f)(2).

Dated: October 29, 2015.

Paul Piquado,
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration

[A–580–868]

Large Residential Washers From the Republic of Korea: Amended Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012–2014

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is amending the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty (AD) order on large residential washers (LRWs) from the Republic of Korea (Korea) to correct a ministerial error. The period of review (POR) is August 3, 2012, through January 31, 2014.

DATES: Effective Date: November 5, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Goldberger or Reza Karamloo, AD/CVD Operations, Office II, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4136 or (202) 482–4470, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 8, 2015, the Department issued the final results of the administrative review of the AD order on LRWs from Korea.1 On September 9, 2015, the Department disclosed to interested parties its calculations for the Final Results.2 On September 15, 2015, we received a timely ministerial error allegation from respondent LG Electronics, Inc. (LGE) regarding its margin calculation.3 We did not receive rebuttal comments from the petitioner.

In the Final Results, we made a ministerial error by not excluding from our margin analysis certain U.S. sales with reported dates prior to August 3, 2012, the effective date of suspension of liquidation and the beginning of the POR.4 To correct the error identified by LGE, we included additional programming language in the margin program.5

Scope of the Order

The products covered by the order are all large residential washers and certain subassemblies thereof from Korea. The products are currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff System of the United States (HTSUS). Products subject to this order may also enter under HTSUS subheadings 8450.20.0040 and 8450.20.0080 of the Harmonized Tariff System of the United States (HTSUS).

Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise subject to this scope is dispositive.6

Ministerial Error

Section 751(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.224(f) define a “ministerial error” as an error “in addition, subtraction, or any arithmetic function, clerical error resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any similar type of unintentional error which the

53 The preliminary determinations concerning the provision of counteravailable subsidies are currently scheduled for November 2, 2015.
54 The preliminary determinations concerning sales at less than fair value are currently scheduled for December 21, 2015.