DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 2000]

Reorganization and Expansion of Foreign-Trade Zone 21 Under Alternative Site Framework; Charleston, South Carolina

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 South Carolina State Ports Authority, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 21, submitted an application to the Board (FTZ Docket B–14–2015, docketed February 25, 2015) for authority to reorganize and expand under the ASF with a service area of the Counties of Charleston, Berkeley, Dorchester, Orangeburg, Williamsburg, Georgetown, Colleton, Jasper, Hampton and Beaufort, 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, to an ASF sunset provision for magnet sites that would terminate authority for Sites 9, 16 and 18 if not activated within five years from the month of approval, and to an ASF sunset provision for usage-driven sites that would terminate authority for Sites 6, 15, 26, 28, 30, 31 and 32 if no foreign-status merchandise is admitted for a bona fide customs purpose within three years from the month of approval.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 2nd day of June 2016.

Paul Piquado, Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 1999]

Reorganization of Foreign-Trade Zone 38 (Expansion of Service Area) Under Alternative Site Framework, Spartanburg County, South Carolina

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 South Carolina State Ports Authority, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 38, submitted an application to the Board (FTZ Docket B–80–2015, docketed November 18, 2015) for authority to expand the service area of the zone to include Pickens, Greenwood, and Abbeville Counties, as described in the application, adjacent to the Greenville/Spartanburg Customs and Border Protection port of entry;

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the Federal Register (80 FR 73700–73701, November 25, 2015) 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; and,

Whereas, the Board hereby orders:

The application to reorganize and expand FTZ 38 to expand the service area under the ASF 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, this 2 day of June 2016.

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

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 2002]

Approval of Expansion of Subzone 78A; Nissan North America, Inc.; Smyrna, Tennessee

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 Foreign-Trade Zones Act provides for “. . . the establishment . . . of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes;” and authorizes the Foreign-Trade Zones Board to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs and Border Protection ports of entry;

Whereas, the Board’s regulations (15 CFR part 400) provide for the establishment of subzones for specific uses;

Whereas, the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 78, has made application to the Board to expand Subzone 78A on behalf of Nissan North America, Inc., located in Smyrna, Tennessee (FTZ Docket B–84–2015, docketed December 23, 2015);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment has been given in the Federal Register (81 FR 63, January 4, 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 memorandum, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations are satisfied:

Now, therefore, the Board hereby approves the expansion of Subzone 78A on behalf of Nissan North America, Inc., as described in the application and Federal Register notice, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations, including Section 400.13.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 2nd day of June 2016.

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

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Correction

Agency: International Trade Administration (ITA). Department of Commerce.
Title: Procedures for Importation of Supplies for Use in Emergency Relief Work.
OMB Control Number: 0625–0256.
Type of Request: Regular Submission.

In the Federal Register of April 11, 2016, FR Vol. 81, No. 69, Page 21315–21316, under Section II. “Method of Collection,” the second line in the paragraph after Attention: should read “Enforcement and Compliance” instead of “Import Administration.”

Dated: June 6, 2016.

Glenna Mickelson,
Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
[A–570–036]
Certain Biaxial Integral Geogrid Products from the People’s Republic of China: Postponement of Preliminary Determination of Antidumping Duty Investigation

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

DATES: June 13, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Julia Hancock or Susan Pulongbarig, AD/CVD Operations, Office V, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1334, or (202) 482–4031, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Postponement of Preliminary Determination

On February 16, 2016, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) published a notice initiating an antidumping duty investigation of certain biaxial integral geogrid products from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”).1 Section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1) state that the Department will make a preliminary determination no later than 140 days after the date of the initiation (i.e., February 8, 2016). Accordingly, the preliminary determination of this antidumping duty investigation is currently due no later than June 27, 2016.

On May 27, 2016, Tensar Corporation (“Petitioner”), made a timely request, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.205(e), for postponement of the preliminary determination, in order to facilitate the Department’s analysis of respondents’ questionnaire responses and interested parties’ surrogate value data submissions. Because there are no compelling reasons to deny the request, in accordance with section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act, the Department is postponing the deadline for the preliminary determination by 50 days.2

For the reasons stated above, the Department, in accordance with section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act, is postponing the deadline for the preliminary determination to no later than 190 days after the date on which the Department initiated this investigation. Therefore, the new deadline for the preliminary determination is August 16, 2016. In accordance with section 735(a)(1) of the Act, the deadline for the final determination of this investigation will continue to be 75 days after the date of the preliminary determination, unless postponed at a later date.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f)(1).

Dated: June 7, 2016.

Paul Piquado,
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
[A–489–501]

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request by interested parties,3 the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on welded carbon steel standard pipe and tube products (welded pipe and tube) from Turkey.4 The period of review (POR) is May 1, 2014, to April 30, 2015. 5 The

1 Wheatland Tube Company, Borusan Mannesmann Boru Sanayi A.S., and Borusan Ishtikal Ticaret requested the instant administrative review.
3 This review covers the following companies: Borusan Ishtikal Ticaret T.A.S. and Borusan Mannesmann Boru Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (collectively, Borusan); Toscelik Profil ve Sac Endustrisi A.S. and Tosyali Dis Ticaret A.S. (collectively, Toscelik); Toscelik Metal Ticaret A.S. (Toscelik Metal);1 Borusan Bilisik Boru Fabrikaları San ve Tic (Borusan Bilisik); Borusan Gemiik Boru Tesisleri A.S. (Borusan Gemiik); Borusan Ishtikal Ithalat ve Dağıtım A.S. (Borusan Ithalat); Borusan Ithalat ve Dağıtım A.S. (Borusan Ithalat); Tecno Pipe and Steel Corporation (Tubeco); Erbosan Erciyas Boru Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Erbosan); and Yucel Boru ve Profil Endustrisi A.S., Yucelboru Ithalat ve Dağıtım A.S., and Cayirova Boru Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (collectively, the Yucel Group).
4 We note that in prior segments of this proceeding, we treated Toscelik Profil ve Sac Endustrisi A.S., Tosyali Dis Ticaret A.S., and Toscelik Metal as the same legal entity. See, e.g., Welded Carbon Steel Standard Pipe and Tube Products From Turkey: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012–2013, 79 FR 71087, 71088 n.8 (December 1, 2014). However, in a prior review, we found that Toscelik Metal has ceased to exist. Id. There is no record evidence for altering this treatment. Therefore, for these preliminary results, we are treating Toscelik and Tosyali as the same legal entity, and continue to find that Toscelik Metal ceased to exist.
5 The