Phase II—Project Management

a. The number of successful multi-family or FLH loan or grant applications the applicant entity has assisted in developing and packaging:
(1) 0–5 applications: 0 points
(2) 6–10 applications: 10 points
(3) 11–15 applications: 20 points
(4) 16 or more applications: 30 points

b. The number of groups seeking loans or grants for the development of multi-family or FLH projects that the applicant entity has provided training and technical assistance:
(1) 0–5 groups: 0 points
(2) 6–10 groups: 5 points
(3) 11–15 groups: 10 points
(4) 16 or more groups: 15 points

c. The number of multi-family or FLH projects for which the applicant entity has assisted in estimating development and construction costs and obtaining the necessary permits and clearances:
(1) 0–5 projects: 0 points
(2) 6–10 projects: 5 points
(3) 11–15 projects: 10 points
(4) 16 or more projects: 15 points

d. The number of times the applicant entity has encountered community opposition and was able to overcome that opposition so that farm labor housing was successfully developed:
(1) 0–2 times: 0 points
(2) 2–5 times: 5 points
(3) 6–10 times: 10 points
(4) 11 or more times: 15 points

e. The number of times the applicant entity has been able to leverage funding from two or more sources for the development of a multi-family or FLH project:
(1) 0–5 times: 0 points
(2) 6–10 times: 5 points
(3) 11–15 times: 10 points
(4) 16 or more times: 15 points

f. The number of FLH projects that the applicant entity has assisted with on-going management (i.e., rent-up, maintenance, etc.):
(1) 0–5 FLH projects: 0 points
(2) 6–10 FLH projects: 5 points
(3) 11–15 FLH projects: 10 points
(4) 16 or more FLH projects: 15 points

The National Office will rank all pre-applications by region and distribute funds to the regions in rank order and within funding limits.

Tie Breakers—In the event two or more proposals within a region are scored with an equal amount of points, selections will be made in the following order:
(1) If an applicant has already had a proposal selected, their proposal will not be selected.
(2) If all or none of the applicants with equivalent scores have already had a proposal selected, the lowest cost proposal will be selected.
(3) If two or more proposals have equivalent scores, all or none of the applicants have already had a proposal selected, and the cost is the same, a proposal will be selected by a random lottery drawing.

RHS will notify all applicants whether their pre-applications have been accepted or rejected and provide appeal rights under 7 CFR part 11, as appropriate.

Reporting. Post-award reporting requirements can be found in the Grant Agreement.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The reporting requirements contained in this Notice have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under Control Number 0575–0181.

Non-Discrimination Requirements

The U.S. Department of Agriculture prohibits discrimination in all of its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, political beliefs, genetic information, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual’s income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA’s TARGET Center at (202) 720–2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., STOP 9410, Washington, DC 20250–9410, or call toll free at (866) 632–9992 (English) or (800) 877–8339 (TDD) or (866) 377–8862 (English Federal—Relay) or (800) 845–6136 (Spanish Federal—Relay). “USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.”

Dated: May 13, 2016.

Tony Hernandez,
Administrator, Rural Housing Service.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[8–2016]

Authorization of Production Activity; Foreign-Trade Subzone 249A; GE Generators (Pensacola) L.L.C.; (Wind Turbine Nacelles and Hubs); Pensacola, Florida


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 3781, January 22, 2016). The FTZ Board has determined that no further review of the activity is warranted at this time. The production activity described in the notification is authorized, subject to the FTZ Act and the FTZ Board’s regulations, including Section 400.14.

Dated: May 16, 2016.

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.
[FR Doc. 2016–12007 Filed 5–20–16; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[6–570–888]

Floor-Standing, Metal-Top Ironing Tables and Certain Parts Thereof From the People’s Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results and Notice of Amended Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2007–2008

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

SUMMARY: On April 7, 2016, the United States Court of International Trade (the CIT or the Court) issued final judgment in Foshan Shunde Yongjian Housewares & Hardwares Co., Ltd. and Polder Inc. v. United States, Court No. 10–00059, sustaining the Department of Commerce’s (the Department) final results of the third redetermination pursuant to remand.1 Consistent with

1 See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Floor Standing Metal Top Ironing Tables and Certain Parts Thereof from the People’s Republic of China, Foshan Shunde Yongjian Housewares & Hardwares Co., Ltd. and Polder Inc. Dated: May 13, 2016.
the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (Federal Circuit) in Timken Co. v United States, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (Timken), as clarified by Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (Diamond Sawblades), the Department is notifying the public that the final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the Department’s final results of the antidumping duty administrative review of floor-standing, metal top ironing tables and certain parts thereof from the People’s Republic of China covering the period August 1, 2007, through July 31, 2008, and is amending the final results with respect to the weighted-average dumping margin assigned to Foshan Shunde Yongjian Housewares & Hardwares Co., Ltd. (Foshan Shunde).²

DATES: Effective April 18, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael J. Heaney or Robert James, 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) 482–4475 or (202) 482–0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 20, 2010, the Department published its Final Results.³ On March 17, 2010, Foshan Shunde, an exporter of the subject merchandise, and Polder, Inc., an importer of the subject merchandise, timely filed a complaint with the CIT to challenge certain aspects of the Final Results. The litigation history of this procedure is outlined below.

On October 12, 2011, the Court remanded the matter.⁴ On June 12, 2012, the Department issued its First Redetermination, in which it determined that Foshan Shunde was: (1) Entitled to a separate rate and (2) assigned an adverse facts available (AFA) rate of 157.68 percent to Foshan Shunde.⁵

Upon consideration of the First Redetermination, on April 8, 2013, the Court affirmed our assignment of a separate rate to Foshan Shunde.⁶ The Court, however, remanded the case to the Department to reconsider its corroboration of the 157.68 percent rate assigned to Foshan Shunde. On July 8, 2013, the Department issued its Second Redetermination, in which it explained that available Customs data corroborated to the extent practicable the 157.68 percent rate assigned to Foshan Shunde.⁷

On June 20, 2014, the Court rejected the corroboration analysis conducted by the Department in its Second Redetermination. The Court remanded the Department’s corroboration of Foshan Shunde’s AFA rate for further consideration.⁸

On October 10, 2014, the Department filed its Third Redetermination, in which it, under protest, assigned a revised AFA rate of 72.29 percent to Foshan Shunde.⁹ This 72.29 percent rate was the rate assigned to Separate Rate companies in the less-than-fair value investigation.¹⁰ On April 7, 2016, the Court sustained the Department’s Third Redetermination, and entered final judgment.¹¹

³ See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand Floor Standing Metal-Top Ironing Tables and Certain Parts Thereof From the People’s Republic of China Foshan Shunde Yongjian Housewares & Hardwares Co., Ltd., and Polder Inc. v. United States, dated June 12, 2012 (First Redetermination).


⁵ See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand Floor Standing Metal-Top Ironing Tables and Certain Parts Thereof From the People’s Republic of China Foshan Shunde Yongjian Housewares & Hardwares Co., Ltd., and Polder Inc. v. United States, dated June 12, 2012 (First Redetermination).


⁷ See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand Floor Standing Metal-Top Ironing Tables and Certain Parts Thereof From the People’s Republic of China Foshan Shunde Yongjian Housewares & Hardwares Co., Ltd., and Polder Inc. v. United States, dated October 10, 2014 (Third Redetermination).

⁸ See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Floor Standing Metal-Top Ironing Tables and Certain Parts Thereof From the People’s Republic of China 69 FR 47868 (August 6, 2004).


For Further Information Contact:

Background
On January 11, 2016, the Department published the Preliminary Results of this administrative review. 1 In the Preliminary Results, we stated our intent to rescind the review for the seven companies that certified that they made no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR, provided we did not receive information from Customs and Border Protection (CBP) which contradicted these companies’ claims of no sales, shipments, or entries of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR. On February 22, 2016, CBP notified the Department that Linyi Bonn Flooring Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Linyi Bonn), and Changbai Mountain Development and Protection Zone Hongtu Wood Industrial Co., Ltd. (Changbai Mountain) made shipments to the United States. On February 26, 2016, and March 11, 2016, respectively, these two companies, withdrew their certifications of no shipments. 2 We issued an additional supplemental questionnaire to Linyi Bonn on January 12, 2016, and received a response on January 22, 2016. 3 On February 17, 2016, we received case briefs from Fine Furniture (Shanghai) Limited (Fine Furniture) and Penghong. 4 No party filed a rebuttal brief.

Scope of the Order
Multilayered wood flooring is composed of an assembly of two or more layers or plies of wood veneer(s) 5 in combination with a core. Imports of the subject merchandise are provided for under the following subheadings of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS): 4412.31.0520; 4412.31.0540; 4412.31.0560; 4412.31.2510; 4412.31.2520; 4412.31.4040; 4412.31.4050; 4412.31.4060; 4412.31.4070; 4412.31.5125; 4412.31.5135; 4412.31.5155; 4412.31.5165; 4412.31.6000; 4412.31.9100; 4412.32.0520; 4412.32.0540; 4412.32.0560; 4412.32.2510; 4412.32.2520; 4412.32.3125; 4412.32.3135; 4412.32.3155; 4412.32.3165; 4412.32.3175; 4412.32.3185; 4412.32.3560; 4412.32.3900; 4412.39.1000; 4412.39.4011; 4412.39.4012; 4412.39.4019; 4412.39.4031; 4412.39.4032; 4412.39.4039; 4412.39.4051; 4412.39.4052; 4412.39.4059; 4412.39.4061; 4412.39.4062; 4412.39.4069; 4412.39.5010; 4412.39.5030; 4412.39.5050; 4412.94.1030; 4412.94.1050; 4412.94.3105; 4412.94.3111; 4412.94.3121; 4412.94.3131; 4412.94.3141; 4412.94.3160; 4412.94.3171; 4412.94.4100; 4412.94.5100; 4412.94.6000; 4412.94.7000; 4412.94.8000; 4412.94.9000; 4412.94.9500; 4412.99.0600; 4412.99.1020; 4412.99.1030; 4412.99.1040; 4412.99.3120; 4412.99.3130; 4412.99.3140; 4412.99.3150; 4412.99.3160; 4412.99.3170; 4412.99.4100; 4412.99.5100; 4412.99.5710; 4412.99.6000; 4412.99.7000; 4412.99.8000; 4412.99.9000; 4412.99.9500; 4418.71.2000; and 4418.72.9500.

While HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written product description remains dispositive. A full description of the scope of the order is contained in the memorandum from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, “Decision Memorandum for Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Multilayered Wood Flooring from the People’s Republic of China” dated concurrently with this notice (Decision Memorandum), which is hereby adopted by this notice.

Analysis of Comments Received
All issues raised in the parties’ briefs are addressed in the Decision Memorandum. A list of the issues raised is attached to this notice at Appendix I. 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 https://access.trade.gov and in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Internet at https://enforcement.trade.gov/fcm. The signed Decision Memorandum and the