

Any party having a substantial interest in these proceedings may request a public hearing on the matter. A written request for a hearing must be submitted to the Trade Adjustment Assistance Division, Room 71030, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230, no later than ten (10) calendar days following publication of this notice. These petitions are received pursuant to section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Please follow the requirements set forth in EDA's regulations at 13 CFR 315.9 for procedures to request a public hearing. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance official number and title for the program under which these petitions are submitted is 11.313, Trade Adjustment Assistance for Firms.

**Irette Patterson,**

*Program Analyst.*

[FR Doc. 2019-13469 Filed 6-24-19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-WH-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Bureau of Industry and Security

#### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

*Agency:* Bureau of Industry and Security.

*Title:* Special Priorities Assistance.

*OMB Control Number:* 0694-0057.

*Form Number(s):* BIS-999.

*Type of Review:* Regular Submission.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden*

*Hours:* 600.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 1,200.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 30 minutes.

*Needs and Uses:* The information collected from defense contractors and suppliers on Form BIS-999, Request for Special Priorities Assistance, is required for the enforcement and administration of special priorities assistance under the Defense Production Act, the Selective Service Act and the Defense Priorities and Allocation System regulation. Contractors may request Special Priorities Assistance (SPA) when placing rated orders with suppliers, to obtain timely delivery of products, materials or services from suppliers, or for any other reason under the DPAS, in support of approved national programs.

The Form BIS-999 is used to apply for such assistance.

*Affected Public:* Business or other for-profit organizations.

*Frequency:* On occasion.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Voluntary.

This information collection request may be viewed at [reginfo.gov](http://www.reginfo.gov) <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/>. Follow the instructions to view Department of Commerce collections currently under review by OMB.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to [OIRA\\_Submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov).

**Sheleen Dumas,**

*Departmental Lead PRA Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Commerce Department.*

[FR Doc. 2019-13448 Filed 6-24-19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-33-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-967; C-570-968]

#### Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Second Amended Final Scope Ruling Pursuant to Court Decision

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

**SUMMARY:** On May 23, 2018, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (the CAFC) reversed and vacated, in part, the Court of International Trade's (the CIT) earlier decisions, vacated Commerce's remand determination, and reinstated Commerce's original scope ruling, in part. In Commerce's original scope ruling, Commerce found that Whirlpool Corporation's (Whirlpool) kitchen appliance door handles with plastic end caps were covered by the general scope language of the antidumping duty (AD) and countervailing duty (CVD) orders on aluminum extrusions from the People's Republic of China (China). On May 1, 2019, the CIT granted Whirlpool's request to dismiss the litigation concerning its handles. Accordingly, Commerce is issuing a second amended final scope ruling.

**DATES:** Applicable June 25, 2019.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Eric Greynolds, AD/CVD Operations, Office III, Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: 202-482-6071.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## Background

On August 4, 2014, Commerce found that kitchen appliance door handles with plastic end caps imported by Whirlpool were subject to the *Orders*.<sup>1</sup> Specifically, Commerce found that the handles did not fall under the finished merchandise or finished goods kit exclusions, based on its interpretation of these exclusions, as adopted in prior scope rulings.<sup>2</sup>

Whirlpool filed suit challenging the Final Scope Ruling. In *Whirlpool I*, the CIT held that "the general scope language is not reasonably interpreted to include the kitchen appliance door handles described in Whirlpool's first scope ruling request{,}" (i.e., the kitchen appliance door handles with plastic end caps).<sup>3</sup> The CIT further held that, even if the general scope language could be reasonably interpreted to include the handles, Commerce's determination that the handles did not satisfy the finished merchandise exclusion based on Commerce's interpretation of the exclusion was in error.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the CIT remanded the Final Scope Ruling to Commerce for reconsideration in light of *Whirlpool I*.<sup>5</sup>

In its Remand Redetermination, under protest, Commerce complied with *Whirlpool I* and found the handles were not covered by the general scope language of the *Orders*.<sup>6</sup> Commerce did not further address the finished merchandise exclusion. The CIT affirmed the Remand Redetermination in *Whirlpool II*.<sup>7</sup> Pursuant to *Whirlpool II*, on September 27, 2016, Commerce published its *First Amended Final Scope Ruling*, finding that the handles

<sup>1</sup> See Memorandum, "Final Scope Ruling on Kitchen Appliance Door Handles with Plastic End Caps and Kitchen Appliance Door Handles without Plastic End Caps," dated August 4, 2014 (Final Scope Ruling).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 16-21, citing, e.g., Memorandum to Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, "Final Scope Ruling on Meridian Kitchen Appliance Door Handles," dated June 21, 2013, (Kitchen Appliance Door Handles I Scope Ruling) and Memorandum to Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, "Final Scope Ruling on J.A. Hancock, Inc.'s Geodesic Structures," (July 17, 2012) (Geodesic Domes Scope Ruling).

<sup>3</sup> See *Whirlpool Corporation v. United States*, 144 F. Supp. 3d 1296, 1303 (CIT 2016) (*Whirlpool I*). The Court affirmed Commerce's determination that the kitchen appliance door handles without end caps are within the scope of the *Orders*. *Id.* at 1306.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 1304.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 1305-07.

<sup>6</sup> See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, *Whirlpool Corp. v. United States*, Court No. 14-00199, Slip Op. 16-08 (CIT February 1, 2016), dated April 15, 2016 (Remand Redetermination).

<sup>7</sup> See *Whirlpool Corporation v. United States*, 182 F. Supp. 3d 1307 (CIT 2016) (*Whirlpool II*).

were not covered by the scope of the *Orders*.<sup>8</sup>

The Aluminum Extrusion Fair Trade Committee (AEFTC), the petitioner in the underlying investigations, appealed. In *Whirlpool III*, the CAFC held that:

{T}he CIT erred when it stated that assembly processes were absent from the specified post-extrusion processes. The general scope language unambiguously includes aluminum extrusions that are part of an assembly. The Orders explicitly include aluminum extrusions “that are assembled after importation” in addition to “aluminum extrusion components that are attached (e.g., by welding or fasteners) to form subassemblies.”<sup>9</sup>

Thus, the CAFC held that Commerce’s determination in the Final Scope Ruling “that the general scope language includes Whirlpool’s assembled handles was supported by substantial evidence.”<sup>10</sup> The CAFC further held that Commerce’s determination that the handles did not satisfy the finished merchandise exclusion was based on an incorrect interpretation of the exclusion.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the CAFC reversed *Whirlpool II*, which affirmed the Remand Redetermination, and instructed the CIT to vacate the Remand Redetermination and reinstate the Final Scope Ruling, in part, with respect to Commerce’s determination that the general scope language included the handles.<sup>12</sup> The CAFC further vacated those portions of *Whirlpool I* that held that the general scope language did not cover the handles.<sup>13</sup> In addition, the CAFC affirmed, in part, those portions of *Whirlpool I* which rejected Commerce’s interpretation of the finished merchandise exclusion and instructed the CIT to vacate the remainder of the Final Scope Ruling.<sup>14</sup> Finally, the CAFC remanded to the CIT for Commerce to reconsider its interpretation of the finished merchandise exclusion as it pertains to Whirlpool’s handles.<sup>15</sup>

On January 14, 2019, in *Whirlpool IV*, in accordance with *Whirlpool III*, the CIT vacated the Remand Redetermination, reinstated those portions of the Final Scope Ruling concluding that Whirlpool’s handles are

within the general scope language of the *Orders*, vacated the remaining portions of the Final Scope Ruling, and remanded for Commerce to reconsider whether Whirlpool’s handles satisfied the finished merchandise exclusion.<sup>16</sup> The CIT further ordered that “{s}hould Commerce determine that the assembled handles are within the scope of the Orders despite the finished merchandise exclusion, it must explain its reasoning and also must clarify whether it is concluding that the handles in their entirety, or only the extruded aluminum components therein, are within the scope of the Orders.”<sup>17</sup>

On April 1, 2019, Commerce issued the Draft Second Remand Determination in which it found the extruded aluminum components of Whirlpool’s handles to be within the scope of the *Orders* and the non-extruded aluminum components to be outside the scope of the *Orders*.<sup>18</sup> Before Commerce issued the final remand redetermination and filed it with the CIT, Whirlpool requested that the CIT voluntarily dismiss the action.<sup>19</sup> On May 1, 2019, the CIT granted Whirlpool’s request to voluntarily dismiss the case.<sup>20</sup>

#### Second Amended Final Scope Ruling

As noted above, there is now a final and conclusive court decision which reinstates those portions of the Final Scope Ruling in which Commerce determined that Whirlpool’s handles are within the general scope language of the *Orders*. As a result of the dismissal of Whirlpool’s action, no further action is required. Therefore, we are issuing a second amended final scope ruling and find that Whirlpool’s handles are within the scope of the *Orders*.

Accordingly, Commerce will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to continue to suspend liquidation of Whirlpool’s handles until appropriate liquidation instructions are sent. As of the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, the cash deposit rate for entries of Whirlpool’s handles will be the applicable cash deposit rate of the exporters of the merchandise from China to the United States.

#### Notification to Interested Parties

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 516A(c)(1) and

(e)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: June 18, 2019.

**Jeffrey I. Kessler,**

*Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2019–13479 Filed 6–24–19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–523–812]

#### Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe From Oman: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2016–2017

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (Commerce) determines that Al Jazeera Steel Products Co. SAOG (Al Jazeera Steel) made sales of certain welded carbon quality steel pipe from Oman at less than normal value (NV) during the period of review (POR) June 8, 2016 through November 30, 2017.

**DATES:** Applicable June 26, 2019.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dennis McClure or Robert Palmer, AD/CVD Operations, Office VIII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5973 or (202) 482–9068, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

Commerce published the *Preliminary Results* on December 11, 2018.<sup>1</sup> For events subsequent to the *Preliminary Results*, see Commerce’s Issues and Decision Memorandum.<sup>2</sup> Commerce exercised its discretion to toll all deadlines affected by the partial federal government closure from December 22, 2018, through the resumption of operations on January 29, 2019.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2016–2017*, 83 FR 63621 (December 11, 2018) (*Preliminary Results*) and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

<sup>2</sup> See Memorandum, “Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results; 2016–2017,” dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

<sup>3</sup> See Memorandum to the Record from Gary Taverman, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations,

<sup>8</sup> See *Aluminum Extrusions from the People’s Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony with Final Scope Ruling and Notice of Amended Final Scope Ruling Pursuant to Court Decision*, 81 FR 66259 (September 27, 2016) (*First Amended Final Scope Ruling*).

<sup>9</sup> See *Whirlpool Corporation v. United States*, 890 F.3d 1302, 1309 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (*Whirlpool III*).

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 1309–11.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 1311.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 1311–12.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at 1312.

<sup>16</sup> See *Whirlpool Corporation v. United States*, 357 F. Supp. 3d 1328, 1363–64 (CIT 2019) (*Whirlpool IV*).

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at 1363.

<sup>18</sup> See Draft Results of Second Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, *Whirlpool Corp. v. United States*, Ct. No. 14–00199, Slip Op. 19–6, dated April 1, 2019 (Draft Second Remand Determination).

<sup>19</sup> See Ct. No. 14–199, ECF Docket No. 75.

<sup>20</sup> See Ct. No. 14–199, ECF Docket No. 76.