

current zone includes the following sites: *Site 1* (534 acres)—Oneida County Airport Industrial Park, Oneida County Airport, Oriskany; *Site 2* (412 acres)—West Rome Industrial Park, 1 Success Dr, Rome; *Site 2a* (100 acres)—Griffiss Business & Technology Park Hanger Road, Rome; *Site 3* (100 acres)—Boonville Industrial Park, Industrial Road, Boonville; *Site 4* (82 acres)—Utica Business Park, Business Park Drive, Utica; and, *Site 5* (52 acres)—East Arterial Industrial Park, Dwyer Avenue, Utica. The zone also includes Subzone 172A (Oneida Ltd.) with three sites in Sherrill and Oneida, New York.

The grantee's proposed service area under the ASF would be Oneida County, New York, as described in the application. If approved, the grantee would be able to serve sites throughout the service area based on companies' needs for FTZ designation. The application indicates that the proposed service area is within and adjacent to the Syracuse, New York Customs and Border Protection port of entry.

The applicant is requesting authority to renumber existing Site 2a as Site 6 and to include the renumbered Site 6 as a "magnet" site, as well as to remove Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and Subzone 172A. The ASF allows for the possible exemption of one magnet site from the "sunset" time limits that generally apply to sites under the ASF, and the applicant proposes that Site 6 be so exempted. The applicant is also requesting approval of the following magnet site: *Proposed Site 7* (316.5 acres)—Marcy Nanocenter at SUNYIT, 5737 Marcy-SUNYIT Parkway, Marcy, Oneida County.

In accordance with the FTZ Board's regulations, Elizabeth Whiteman of the FTZ Staff is designated examiner to evaluate and analyze the facts and information presented in the application and case record and to report findings and recommendations to the FTZ Board.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the FTZ Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is June 14, 2016. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to June 29, 2016.

A copy of the application will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 21013, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230-0002, and in the "Reading Room" section of the FTZ Board's Web site, which is accessible

via www.trade.gov/ftz. For further information, contact Elizabeth Whiteman at Elizabeth.Whiteman@trade.gov or (202) 482-0473.

Dated: April 12, 2016.

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016-08791 Filed 4-14-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-823-805]

Silicomanganese From Ukraine: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dmitry Vladimirov or Minoo Hatten, AD/CVD Operations, Office I, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0665, and (202) 482-1690, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 3, 2015, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the *Federal Register* a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order on silicomanganese from Ukraine for the period of review (POR), August 1, 2014, through July 31, 2015.¹ On September 3, 2015, we received an untimely-filed request² for an administrative review from two Ukrainian producers and/or exporters of silicomanganese, JSC Zaporizhyya Ferroalloy Plant (ZFP) and JSC Nikopol Ferroalloy Plant (NFP), requesting an administrative review of exports of subject merchandise for the period of September 1, 2014, through August 31, 2015. On September 21, 2015, we received comments from a domestic interested party, Eramet Marietta, Inc. (Eramet), objecting to initiation and placing on the record certain import statistics stating that

there were no entries of subject merchandise from Ukraine during the period of review.

On October 6, 2015, the Department initiated the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on silicomanganese from Ukraine with respect to ZFP and NFP for the POR, August 1, 2014, through July 31, 2015,³ notwithstanding the untimely nature of the Ukrainian producers' request for review.

In accordance with our practice, we requested information from U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) concerning imports of subject merchandise from these companies during the POR. We received the requested CBP information, which showed that neither ZFP nor NFP had suspended entries of subject merchandise during the POR. On October 6, 2015, we documented this finding and invited comments from interested parties regarding this CBP query result.⁴

On October 19, 2015, we received comments from domestic interested parties, Eramet and Felman Production, LLC (collectively, U.S. producers). On October 20, 2015, we received comments from ZFP and NFP (Ukrainian producers). ZFP's and NFP's October 20, 2015, submission contained documentation establishing that both companies made both a sale and an entry of subject merchandise in August 2015.

Because there is no evidence that there were entries of subject merchandise into the United States from Ukraine during the POR, on November 17, 2015, the Department placed a memorandum on the record notifying interested parties of its intent to rescind the 2014-2015 administrative review of silicomanganese from Ukraine, and invited comments.⁵ In its November 17, 2015, memorandum, the Department rejected the Ukrainian producers' arguments that the Department provided defective or inadequate notice concerning the correct anniversary month of the antidumping duty order on silicomanganese from Ukraine, and found no basis to alter the POR to capture the Ukrainian producers' entries

¹ See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 80 FR 45952 (August 3, 2015) (*August 2015 Opportunity Notice*).

² The Ukrainian producers' September 3, 2015, request for an administrative review was untimely under 19 CFR 351.213(b) and 19 CFR 351.302(d) because we did not receive it during the anniversary month of August 2015, as required by the regulations and specified in the *August 2015 Opportunity Notice*.

³ See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 80 FR 60356 (October 6, 2015).

⁴ See Memorandum to the File, "Silicomanganese from Ukraine—U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Data" dated October 6, 2015.

⁵ See Memorandum to James Maeder, Senior Director for AD/CVD Operations, Office I, "2014-2015 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Silicomanganese from Ukraine; Intent to Rescind Administrative Review" dated November 17, 2015.

of subject merchandise made after the POR.⁶

On November 24, 2015, we received comments from ZFP and NFP. On November 30, 2015, we received rebuttal comments from U.S. producers.

Rescission of Review

It is the Department's practice to rescind an administrative review pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3) when there are no suspended entries of subject merchandise during the POR from the country in question.⁷ At the end of an administrative review, all suspended entries during the POR for the parties under review are liquidated at the assessment rate computed in the final results of review.⁸ Therefore, since the purpose of an administrative review is to assess antidumping duties, there must be a suspended AD/CVD entry to be liquidated at the newly calculated assessment rate. As discussed in the Decision Memorandum accompanying this notice,⁹ we find that, because there were no entries of subject merchandise during the POR from Ukraine, we are rescinding the 2014–2015 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on silicomanganese from Ukraine, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised by parties in this administrative review are addressed in the accompanying Decision Memorandum, which is adopted by this notice. The Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://access.trade.gov>, and to all parties in the Central Records Unit, room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the internet at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html>. The signed and electronic versions of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ See, e.g., *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Brazil: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 77 FR 32498 (June 1, 2012).

⁸ See 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1).

⁹ See Memorandum to James Maeder, Senior Director for AD/CVD Operations, Office I, "2014–2015 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Silicomanganese from Ukraine; Rescission of Administrative Review" dated concurrently with this notice (Decision Memorandum).

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: April 7, 2016.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2016–08787 Filed 4–14–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–836]

Glycine From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of 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 an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on glycine from the People's Republic of China (PRC). The period of review (POR) is March 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015. This review covers five companies, Baoding Mantong Fine Chemistry Co., Ltd. (Baoding Mantong), Nutracare International (Nutracare), Ravi Industries (Ravi), Kumar Industries (Kumar), and Rudraa International (Rudraa). The Department preliminarily finds that these five companies did not have reviewable entries during the POR. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

DATES: *Effective Date:* April 15, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dena Crossland or Brian Davis, AD/CVD Operations, Office VI, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3362 or (202) 482–7924, respectively.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by the antidumping duty order is glycine, which is a free-flowing crystalline material, like salt or sugar.¹ The subject

¹ See "Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Glycine from the People's Republic of China; 2014–2015" from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, dated concurrently with this notice (Preliminary Decision

Memorandum), for a complete description of the scope of the order.

merchandise is currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheading 2922.49.4020. The HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes only; the written product description of the scope of the order is dispositive.²

Methodology

The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). For a full description of the methodology underlying our conclusions, see Preliminary Decision Memorandum. This memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://access.trade.gov> and is available to all parties in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/>. The signed and the electronic versions of the memorandum are identical in content.

Background

On April 30, 2015, in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review.³ For a detailed background discussion, see Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

Preliminary Results of Review

The Department preliminarily determines that Baoding Mantong, Kumar, Nutracare, Ravi, and Rudraa did not have reviewable transactions of subject merchandise during the POR.

Disclosure and Public Comment

Interested parties are invited to comment on the preliminary results and may submit case briefs and/or written comments, filed electronically using ACCESS, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(ii). Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case

Memorandum), for a complete description of the scope of the order.

² See *Glycine from the People's Republic of China: Antidumping Duty Order*, 60 FR 16116 (March 29, 1995).

³ See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 80 FR 24233 (April 30, 2015).