

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 2007]

Reorganization of Foreign-Trade Zone 70 (Expansion of Service Area) Under Alternative Site Framework; Detroit, Michigan

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) (15 CFR Sec. 400.2(c)) as an option for the establishment or reorganization of zones;

Whereas, the Greater Detroit Foreign-Trade Zone, Inc., grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 70, submitted an application to the Board (FTZ Docket B–10–2016, docketed February 18, 2016, amended June 9, 2016) for authority to expand the service area of the zone to include Livingston County and a portion of Lenawee County, as described in the application, adjacent to the Detroit Customs and Border Protection port of entry;

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (81 FR 9168, February 24, 2016) and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations are satisfied;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The amended application to reorganize FTZ 70 to expand the service area under the ASF to include Livingston County and a portion of Lenawee County is approved, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.13, and to the Board's standard 2,000-acre activation limit for the zone.

Signed at Washington, DC, July 29, 2016.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Enforcement and Compliance, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

ATTEST:

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–18658 Filed 8–4–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 2006]

Reorganization of Foreign-Trade Zone 172 Under Alternative Site Framework, Oneida County, New York

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) (15 CFR Sec. 400.2(c)) as an option for the establishment or reorganization of zones;

Whereas, the County of Oneida, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 172, submitted an application to the Board (FTZ Docket B–19–2016, docketed April 12, 2016) for authority to reorganize under the ASF with a service area of Oneida County, New York, adjacent to the Syracuse Customs and Border Protection port of entry, FTZ 172's existing Site 2a would be renumbered as Site 6 and included as a magnet site, Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and Subzone 172A would be removed from the zone, and the grantee proposes an additional magnet site (Site 7);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (81 FR 22210–22211, April 15, 2016) 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 the Board's regulations are satisfied;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The application to reorganize FTZ 172 under the ASF is approved, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.13, to the Board's standard 2,000-acre activation limit for the zone, and to an ASF sunset provision for magnet sites that would terminate authority for Site 7 if not activated within five years from the month of approval.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 29th day of July 2016.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Enforcement and Compliance, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–18667 Filed 8–4–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[B–18–2016]

Authorization of Limited Production Activity; Foreign-Trade Zone (FTZ) 186—Waterville, Maine; Flemish Master Weavers; Subzone 186A (Area Rugs) Sanford, Maine

On March 31, 2016, the City of Waterville, Maine, grantee of FTZ 186, submitted a notification of proposed production activity to the FTZ Board on behalf of Flemish Master Weavers, within Subzone 186A, in Sanford, Maine.

The notification was processed in accordance with the regulations of the FTZ Board (15 CFR part 400), including notice in the **Federal Register** inviting public comment (81 FR 22210, April 15, 2016). The FTZ Board has determined that further review of part of the proposed activity is warranted at this time. The production activity described in the notification is authorized on a limited basis, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.14, and further subject to a restriction requiring that foreign-status polypropylene and polyester yarns (HTSUS Subheadings 5402.59 and 5402.33) be admitted to the subzone in privileged foreign status (19 CFR 146.41).

Dated: July 29, 2016.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–18539 Filed 8–4–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brenda E. Waters, Office of AD/CVD Operations, Customs Liaison Unit, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–4735.

Background

Each year during the anniversary month of the publication of an

antidumping or countervailing duty order, finding, or suspended investigation, an interested party, as defined in section 771(9) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), may request, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213, that the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) conduct an administrative review of that antidumping or countervailing duty order, finding, or suspended investigation.

All deadlines for the submission of comments or actions by the Department discussed below refer to the number of calendar days from the applicable starting date.

Respondent Selection

In the event the Department limits the number of respondents for individual examination for administrative reviews initiated pursuant to requests made for the orders identified below, the Department intends to select respondents based on U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) data for U.S. imports during the period of review. We intend to release the CBP data under Administrative Protective Order (“APO”) to all parties having an APO within five days of publication of the initiation notice and to make our decision regarding respondent selection within 21 days of publication of the initiation **Federal Register** notice. Therefore, we encourage all parties interested in commenting on respondent selection to submit their APO applications on the date of publication of the initiation notice, or as soon thereafter as possible. The Department invites comments regarding the CBP data and respondent selection within five days of placement of the CBP data on the record of the review.

In the event the Department decides it is necessary to limit individual

examination of respondents and conduct respondent selection under section 777A(c)(2) of the Act:

In general, the Department finds that determinations concerning whether particular companies should be “collapsed” (*i.e.*, treated as a single entity for purposes of calculating antidumping duty rates) require a substantial amount of detailed information and analysis, which often require follow-up questions and analysis. Accordingly, the Department will not conduct collapsing analyses at the respondent selection phase of this review and will not collapse companies at the respondent selection phase unless there has been a determination to collapse certain companies in a previous segment of this antidumping proceeding (*i.e.*, investigation, administrative review, new shipper review or changed circumstances review). For any company subject to this review, if the Department determined, or continued to treat, that company as collapsed with others, the Department will assume that such companies continue to operate in the same manner and will collapse them for respondent selection purposes. Otherwise, the Department will not collapse companies for purposes of respondent selection. Parties are requested to (a) identify which companies subject to review previously were collapsed, and (b) provide a citation to the proceeding in which they were collapsed. Further, if companies are requested to complete the Quantity and Value Questionnaire for purposes of respondent selection, in general each company must report volume and value data separately for itself. Parties should not include data for any other party, even if they believe they should be treated as a single entity with that other party. If a company was

collapsed with another company or companies in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding where the Department considered collapsing that entity, complete quantity and value data for that collapsed entity must be submitted.

Deadline for Withdrawal of Request for Administrative Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), a party that requests a review may withdraw that request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review. The regulation provides that the Department may extend this time if it is reasonable to do so. In order to provide parties additional certainty with respect to when the Department will exercise its discretion to extend this 90-day deadline, interested parties are advised that, with regard to reviews requested on the basis of anniversary months on or after August 2016, the Department does not intend to extend the 90-day deadline unless the requestor demonstrates that an extraordinary circumstance prevented it from submitting a timely withdrawal request. Determinations by the Department to extend the 90-day deadline will be made on a case-by-case basis.

The Department is providing this notice on its Web site, as well as in its “Opportunity to Request Administrative Review” notices, so that interested parties will be aware of the manner in which the Department intends to exercise its discretion in the future.

Opportunity to request a review: Not later than the last day of August 2016,¹ interested parties may request administrative review of the following orders, findings, or suspended investigations, with anniversary dates in August for the following periods:

	Period of review
Antidumping Duty Proceedings	
GERMANY:	
Seamless Line and Pressure Pipe A-428-820	8/1/15-7/31/16
Sodium Nitrite A-428-841	8/1/15-7/31/16
ITALY: Granular Polytetrafluorethylene Resin A-475-703	8/1/15-7/31/16
JAPAN:	
Brass Sheet & Strip A-588-704	8/1/15-7/31/16
Tin Mill Products A-588-854	8/1/15-7/31/16
MALAYSIA: Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags A-557-813	8/1/15-7/31/16
MEXICO: Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube A-201-836	8/1/15-7/31/16
REPUBLIC OF KOREA:	
Large Power Transformers A-580-867	8/1/15-7/31/16
Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube A-580-859	8/1/15-7/31/16
ROMANIA: Carbon and Alloy Seamless Standard, Line, and Pressure Pipe (under 4½ inches) A-485-805	8/1/15-7/31/16
SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM: Frozen Fish Fillets A-552-801	8/1/15-7/31/16

¹ Or the next business day, if the deadline falls on a weekend, federal holiday or any other day when the Department is closed.

	Period of review
THAILAND: Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags A-549-821	8/1/15-7/31/16
THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA:	
Floor-Standing, Metal-Top Ironing Tables and Parts Thereof A-570-888	8/1/15-7/31/16
Laminated Woven Sacks A-570-916	8/1/15-7/31/16
Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube A-570-914	8/1/15-7/31/16
Passenger Vehicle and Light Truck Tires A-570-016	1/27/15-7/31/16
Petroleum Wax Candles A-570-504	8/1/15-7/31/16
Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags A-570-886	8/1/15-7/31/16
Sodium Nitrate A-570-925	8/1/15-7/31/16
Steel Nails A-570-909	8/1/15-7/31/16
Sulfanilic Acid A-570-815	8/1/15-7/31/16
Tetrahydrofurfuryl Alcohol A-570-887	8/1/15-7/31/16
Tow-Behind Lawn Groomers and Parts Thereof A-570-939	8/1/15-7/31/16
UKRAINE: Silicomanganese A-823-805	8/1/15-7/31/16
Countervailing Duty Proceedings	
REPUBLIC OF KOREA: Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coil C-580-835	1/1/15-12/31/15
THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA:	
Laminated Woven Sacks C-570-917	1/1/15-12/31/15
Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube C-570-915	1/1/15-12/31/15
Passenger Vehicle and Light Truck Tires C-570-017	12/1/14-12/31/15
Sodium Nitrite C-570-926	1/1/15-12/31/15
Suspension Agreements	
None	

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), an interested party as defined by section 771(9) of the Act may request in writing that the Secretary conduct an administrative review. For both antidumping and countervailing duty reviews, the interested party must specify the individual producers or exporters covered by an antidumping finding or an antidumping or countervailing duty order or suspension agreement for which it is requesting a review. In addition, a domestic interested party or an interested party described in section 771(9)(B) of the Act must state why it desires the Secretary to review those particular producers or exporters. If the interested party intends for the Secretary to review sales of merchandise by an exporter (or a producer if that producer also exports merchandise from other suppliers) which was produced in more than one country of origin and each country of origin is subject to a separate order, then the interested party must state specifically, on an order-by-order basis, which exporter(s) the request is intended to cover.

Note that, for any party the Department was unable to locate in prior segments, the Department will not accept a request for an administrative review of that party absent new information as to the party's location. Moreover, if the interested party who files a request for review is unable to locate the producer or exporter for which it requested the review, the

interested party must provide an explanation of the attempts it made to locate the producer or exporter at the same time it files its request for review, in order for the Secretary to determine if the interested party's attempts were reasonable, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.303(f)(3)(ii).

As explained in *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003), and *Non-Market Economy Antidumping Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 76 FR 65694 (October 24, 2011) the Department clarified its practice with respect to the collection of final antidumping duties on imports of merchandise where intermediate firms are involved. The public should be aware of this clarification in determining whether to request an administrative review of merchandise subject to antidumping findings and orders.²

Further, as explained in *Antidumping Proceedings: Announcement of Change in Department Practice for Respondent Selection in Antidumping Duty Proceedings and Conditional Review of the Nonmarket Economy Entity in NME Antidumping Duty Proceedings*, 78 FR 65963 (November 4, 2013), the Department clarified its practice with regard to the conditional review of the non-market economy (NME) entity in administrative reviews of antidumping

² See also the Enforcement and Compliance Web site at <http://trade.gov/enforcement/>.

duty orders. The Department will no longer consider the NME entity as an exporter conditionally subject to administrative reviews. Accordingly, the NME entity will not be under review unless the Department specifically receives a request for, or self-initiates, a review of the NME entity.³ In administrative reviews of antidumping duty orders on merchandise from NME countries where a review of the NME entity has not been initiated, but where an individual exporter for which a review was initiated does not qualify for a separate rate, the Department will issue a final decision indicating that the company in question is part of the NME entity. However, in that situation, because no review of the NME entity was conducted, the NME entity's entries were not subject to the review and the rate for the NME entity is not subject to change as a result of that review (although the rate for the individual exporter may change as a function of the finding that the exporter is part of the NME entity). Following initiation of an antidumping administrative review when there is no review requested of the NME entity, the Department will instruct CBP to liquidate entries for all exporters not named in the initiation notice, including those that were suspended at the NME entity rate.

³ In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), parties should specify that they are requesting a review of entries from exporters comprising the entity, and to the extent possible, include the names of such exporters in their request.

All requests must be filed electronically in Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System ("ACCESS") on Enforcement and Compliance's ACCESS Web site at <http://access.trade.gov>.⁴ Further, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(f)(1)(i), a copy of each request must be served on the petitioner and each exporter or producer specified in the request.

The Department will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Initiation of Administrative Review of Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation" for requests received by the last day of August 2016. If the Department does not receive, by the last day of August 2016, a request for review of entries covered by an order, finding, or suspended investigation listed in this notice and for the period identified above, the Department will instruct CBP to assess antidumping or countervailing duties on those entries at a rate equal to the cash deposit of (or bond for) estimated antidumping or countervailing duties required on those entries at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption and to continue to collect the cash deposit previously ordered.

For the first administrative review of any order, there will be no assessment of antidumping or countervailing duties on entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the relevant provisional-measures "gap" period of the order, if such a gap period is applicable to the period of review.

This notice is not required by statute but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: July 28, 2016.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2016-18540 Filed 8-4-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-992]

Monosodium Glutamate From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014-2015

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the "Department") is conducting the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on monosodium glutamate ("MSG") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") covering the period of review ("POR") May 8, 2014 through October 31, 2015. This review covers 38 manufacturers/exporters ("the companies") of the subject merchandise. None of these companies have filed a separate rate application ("SRA") and/or a separate rate certification ("SRC") to establish its separate rate status. Therefore, the Department preliminarily finds that the companies are part of the PRC-wide entity. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

DATES: Effective August 5, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathryn Wallace or Alexander Cipolla, AD/CVD Operations, Office VII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-6251 or (202) 482-4956, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On November 3, 2015, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on MSG from the PRC.¹ In response, on November 30, 2015, Ajinomoto North America, Inc. ("Petitioner" or "Ajinomoto") requested a review of 38 companies.² Also on November 20, 2015, Neimenggu Fufeng Biotechnologies Co., Ltd. and its affiliate, Hulunbeier Northeast Fufeng Biotechnologies Co., Ltd. (collectively,

¹ See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 80 FR 67706 (November 3, 2015).

² See Letter from Ajinomoto to the Department of Commerce, Re: "Monosodium Glutamate from China: Request for Administrative Review," dated November 30, 2015, at footnote 1 which lists 38 companies for which Ajinomoto sought review.

"Fufeng") requested a review.³ The Department initiated a review of all 38 companies, which included Fufeng, on January 7, 2016.⁴ On February 8, 2016, Fufeng timely withdrew its request for review.⁵ No party timely submitted an SRA or an SRC.⁶ Thereafter, Petitioner submitted comments on the Department's selection of respondents, encouraging the Department to employ its customary policy to treat companies as a part of the country-wide entity in reviews where no party submits an SRA or SRC.⁷

Scope of the Order

The product covered by this order is MSG, whether or not blended or in solution with other products. Specifically, MSG that has been blended or is in solution with other product(s) is included in this scope when the resulting mix contains 15 percent or more of MSG by dry weight. Products with which MSG may be blended include, but are not limited to, salts, sugars, starches, maltodextrins, and various seasonings. Further, MSG is included in this order regardless of physical form (including, but not limited to, in monohydrate or anhydrous form, or as substrates, solutions, dry powders of any particle size, or unfinished forms such as MSG slurry), end-use application, or packaging. MSG in monohydrate form has a molecular formula of C₅H₈NO₄Na·H₂O, a Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) registry number of 6106-04-3, and a Unique Ingredient Identifier (UNII) number of W81N5U6R6U. MSG in anhydrous form has a molecular formula of C₅H₈NO₄Na, a CAS registry number of 142-47-2, and a UNII number of C3C196L9FG. Merchandise covered by the scope of this order is currently

³ See Letter from Fufeng to the Department of Commerce, Re: "Request for the First Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Monosodium Glutamate from the People's Republic of China," dated November 30, 2015.

⁴ See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 81 FR 736 (January 7, 2016) ("Initiation Notice").

⁵ See Letter from Fufeng to the Department of Commerce, Re: "Withdrawal of Review Request: First Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Monosodium Glutamate from the People's Republic of China," dated February 8, 2016. Because the Petitioner's request for review included Fufeng, it was not removed from the administrative review.

⁶ Because of tolling, the deadline for SRAs and SRCs was extended four business days until February 12, 2016. See Memorandum from Ron Lorentzen, Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, Re: "Tolling of Administrative Deadlines as a Result of the Government Closure during Snowstorm 'Jonas,'" dated January 27, 2016.

⁷ See Letter from Ajinomoto to the Department of Commerce, Re: "MSG from China: Comments on Respondent Selection," dated February 29, 2016.

⁴ See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures*, 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011).