

Newark Customs and Border Protection port of entry. The application was submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR part 400). It was formally filed on December 7, 2011.

FTZ 49 was approved by the Board on April 6, 1979 (Board Order 146, 44 FR 22502, 4/16/79) and expanded on May 26, 1983 (Board Order 211, 48 FR 24958, 6/3/83), on October 23, 1987 (Board Order 365, 52 FR 41599, 10/29/87), on April 19, 1990 (Board Order 470, 55 FR 17478, 4/25/90), on December 15, 1999 (Board Order 1067, 64 FR 72462–72643, 12/28/99), on April 14, 2006 (71 FR 23895, 4/25/06), on February 28, 2007 (Board Order 1504, 72 FR 10642–10643, 3/9/07), and on July 16, 2009 (Board Order 1634, 74 FR 37688–37689, 7/29/09).

The current zone project includes the following sites in the Newark/Elizabeth area: *Site 1* (total—2,121 acres)—Port Newark/Elizabeth Port Authority Marine Terminal (2,075 acres), a parcel (23 acres) located at 888 Doremus Avenue, Newark, a parcel (6 acres) located at 580 Division Street, Elizabeth, and a parcel (17 acres) located at 251–259 Kapowski Road, Elizabeth; *Site 2* (64 acres)—Global Terminal and Container Services facility (41 acres) and adjacent Jersey Distribution Services facility (23 acres) Jersey City/Bayonne; *Site 3* (124 acres)—Port Authority Industrial Park, adjacent to the Port Newark/Elizabeth Port Authority Marine Terminal; *Site 4* (198 acres)—Port Authority Auto Marine Terminal (145 acres) and adjacent 53-acre Greenville Industrial Park on Upper New York Bay's Port Jersey Channel in Bayonne and Jersey City; *Site 5* (40 acres)—Newark International Airport jet fuel storage and distribution system in the Cities of Newark and Elizabeth (Union and Essex Counties); *Site 6* (407 acres)—within an industrial park located at 100 Central Avenue, Kearny; *Site 7* (114 acres, sunset 3/31/14)—within the I-Port 12 industrial park, located at exit 12 of the NJ Turnpike, Carteret; *Site 8* (176 acres, sunset 3/31/14)—within the I-Port 440 industrial park, located east of State St. and north of the Outer Bridge Crossing, Perth Amboy; *Site 9* (317 acres, sunset 3/31/14)—Port Reading Business Park located on Port Reading Avenue, Woodbridge; *Site 10* (73 acres, sunset 3/31/14)—Port Elizabeth Business Park located at 10 North Avenue East, Elizabeth; *Site 11* (379 acres, sunset 7/31/14)—Heller Industrial Park located at 205 Mill Road, Edison; and, *Site 12* (23 acres, sunset 7/31/14)—located at 400, 440, 490 Heller

Park Court and 1 Industrial Road, South Brunswick.

The applicant is now requesting authority to expand the zone to include the following site: *Proposed Site 13* (546 acres)—Raritan Center Business Park, Woodbridge Avenue & Raritan Center Parkway, Townships of Edison and Woodbridge, Middlesex County. No specific manufacturing authority is being requested at this time. Such requests would be made on a case-by-case basis.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, Kathleen Boyce 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 Board.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is February 13, 2012. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to February 27, 2012.

A copy of the application will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 2111, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the "Reading Room" section of the Board's Web site, which is accessible via <http://www.trade.gov/ftz>. For further information, contact Kathleen Boyce at *Kathleen.Boyce@trade.gov* or (202) 482–1346.

Dated: December 7, 2011.

**Andrew McGilvray,**  
*Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2011–32090 Filed 12–13–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration [A–201–805]

#### Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**SUMMARY:** On August 10, 2011, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain

circular welded non-alloy steel pipe from Mexico.<sup>1</sup> This administrative review covers mandatory respondents Mueller Comercial de Mexico, S. de R.L. de C.V. (Mueller), Southland Pipe Nipples Company, Inc. (Southland), Lamina y Placa Comercial, S.A. de C.V. (Lamina), and Tuberia Nacional, S.A. de C.V. (TUNA).<sup>2</sup>

We determine that the respondents did not have reviewable sales, shipments, or entries during the POR.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* December 14, 2011.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mark Flessner or Robert James, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6312 and (202) 482–0649, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On August 10, 2011, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain circular welded non-alloy steel pipe from Mexico for the period November 1, 2009, to October 31, 2010. See Preliminary Results.

In response to the Department's invitation to comment on the preliminary results of this review, Petitioner Wheatland Tube Company filed a case brief on September 9, 2011. Respondents Lamina and TUNA jointly filed a rebuttal brief on September 13, 2011.

#### Scope of the Order

The products covered by this order are circular welded non-alloy steel pipes and tubes, of circular cross-section, not more than 406.4 millimeters (16 inches) in outside diameter, regardless of wall thickness, surface finish (black, galvanized, or painted), or end finish (plain end, beveled end, threaded, or threaded and coupled). These pipes and tubes are generally known as standard pipes and tubes and are intended for the low pressure conveyance of water, steam, natural gas, and other liquids and gases in plumbing and heating systems, air conditioning

<sup>1</sup> See *Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From Mexico: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 49437 (August 10, 2011) (*Preliminary Results*).

<sup>2</sup> The Department determined that Lamina is the successor-in-interest to TUNA. See *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From Mexico*, 75 FR 82374 (December 30, 2010).

units, automatic sprinkler systems, and other related uses, and generally meet ASTM A-53 specifications. Standard pipe may also be used for light load-bearing applications, such as for fence tubing, and as structural pipe tubing used for framing and support members for reconstruction or load-bearing purposes in the construction, shipbuilding, trucking, farm equipment, and related industries. Unfinished conduit pipe is also included in these orders. All carbon steel pipes and tubes within the physical description outlined above are included within the scope of this order, except line pipe, oil country tubular goods, boiler tubing, mechanical tubing, pipe and tube hollows for redraws, finished scaffolding, and finished conduit. Standard pipe that is dual or triple certified/stenciled that enters the U.S. as line pipe of a kind used for oil or gas pipelines is also not included in this order.

The merchandise covered by the order and subject to this review are currently classified in the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) at subheadings: 7306.30.10.00, 7306.30.50.25, 7306.30.50.32, 7306.30.50.40, 7306.30.50.55, 7306.30.50.85, and 7306.30.50.90. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of these proceedings is dispositive.

#### Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case brief and rebuttal brief are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum (Decision Memorandum) from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated December 2, 2011, which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues raised is attached to this notice as Appendix I. The Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Import Administration's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (IA ACCESS). Access to IA ACCESS is available in the Central Records Unit (CRU), room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Internet at <http://www.trade.gov/ia/>. The signed Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

#### Final Results of Review

Because we have found that the respondents did not have reviewable sales, shipments, or entries during the POR, there is no change in the antidumping duties for any of the respondents.

#### Assessment

The Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, pursuant to section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.212(b). We will issue appraisal instructions directly to CBP to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries by applying the assessment rate to the entered value of the merchandise. Pursuant to 19 CFR 356.8(a), the Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 41 days after the date of publication of these final results of review.

Since the implementation of the 1997 regulations, our practice concerning no shipment respondents had been to rescind the administrative review if the respondent certifies that it had no shipments and we have confirmed through our examination of CBP data, as well as a no-shipment query to the ports, that there were no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. See *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties*, 62 FR 27296, 27393 (May 19, 1997); see also *Oil Country Tubular Goods From Japan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Review*, 70 FR 53161, 53162 (September 5, 2005), unchanged in *Oil Country Tubular Goods From Japan: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 95 (January 3, 2006). In such circumstances, we normally instructed CBP to liquidate any entries from the no-shipment company at the deposit rate in effect on the date of entry.

In our May 6, 2003, "automatic assessment" clarification, we explained that, where respondents in an administrative review demonstrate that they had no knowledge of sales through resellers to the United States, we would instruct CBP to liquidate such entries at the all-others rate applicable to the proceeding. See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003) (*Assessment Policy Notice*).

Because "as entered" liquidation instructions do not alleviate the concerns which the May 2003 clarification was intended to address,

we find it appropriate in this case to instruct CBP to liquidate any existing entries of merchandise produced by the respondents, and exported by other parties at the all-others rate. See, e.g., *Magnesium Metal From the Russian Federation: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 75 FR 26922, 26923 (May 13, 2010), unchanged in *Magnesium Metal From the Russian Federation: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 75 FR 56989, 56990 (September 17, 2010). In addition, the Department finds that it is more consistent with the May 2003 clarification not to rescind the review in its entirety but, rather, to complete the review with respect to the respondents, issuing appropriate instructions to CBP based on the final results of the review. See the "Assessment Rates" section of this notice below.

#### Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of administrative review, consistent with section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed companies will be the rates in effect from the most recently-completed POR; (2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, but was covered in a previous review or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 32.62 percent, the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From Mexico*, 57 FR 42953 (September 17, 1992). These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

#### Notification to Interested Parties

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation

of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Department's presumption that reimbursement of the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305, which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 2, 2011.

**Ronald K. Lorentzen,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

#### **Appendix—List of Issues in Decision Memorandum**

Comment 1: Allegedly Incorrect

Classification of Entry Documents

Comment 2: Verification

[FR Doc. 2011–32102 Filed 12–13–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

## **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

### **International Trade Administration**

[A–570–937]

#### **Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the First Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order**

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**SUMMARY:** On June 10, 2011, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) published the preliminary results of the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on citric acid and certain citrate salts (“citric acid”) from the People's Republic of China (“PRC”), covering the period November 20, 2008, through April 30, 2010. See *Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of the First Administrative Review of the*

*Antidumping Duty Order; and Partial Rescission of Administrative Review*, 76 FR 34048 (June 10, 2011) (“*Preliminary Results*”). We invited interested parties to comment on our *Preliminary Results*. Based on our findings from on-site verifications and analysis of the comments received, we made certain changes to our margin calculations for the respondents. The final dumping margins for this review are listed in the “Final Results of the Review” section below.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* December 14, 2011.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Krisha Hill or Maisha Cryor, AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4037 or (202) 482–5831, respectively.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

On June 10, 2011, the Department published the *Preliminary Results* of the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on citric acid from the PRC. On June 30, 2011, both respondents, RZBC Co., Ltd., RZCB Imp. & Exp. Co., Ltd., and RZBC (Juxian) Co., Ltd. (collectively “RZBC”) and Yixing Union Biochemical Co., Ltd. (“Yixing Union”), submitted surrogate value comments. On July 20, 2011, the Department released a Memorandum to the File, titled “First Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts from the People's Republic of China: Industry-Specific Surrogate Wage Rate and Surrogate Financial Ratio Adjustments,” dated July 20, 2011 (“Wage Rate Memorandum”), for use in these final results. On June 30, 2010, both RZBC and Yixing Union submitted surrogate value comments. On August 3, 2011, Petitioners submitted comments on the industry-specific surrogate wage rate methodology and offered an alternative source to value the wage rate.<sup>1</sup> On August 4, 2011, the Department published a notice in the **Federal Register** fully extending the time limit for the final results of review by the full 60 days allowed under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), to December 7, 2011.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Petitioners are Archer Daniels Midland Company, Cargill, Incorporated, and Tate & Lyle Americas LLC.

<sup>2</sup> See *Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts from the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time*

In preparation for verification, the Department issued supplemental questionnaires to RZBC and Yixing Union on August 8, 2011. Yixing Union submitted its supplemental questionnaire response, with an updated factor of production (“FOP”) database, on August 23, 2011. RZBC submitted its supplemental questionnaire response, with updated U.S. sales and FOP databases, on August 24, 2011. From August 29, 2011, to September 2, 2011, and from September 5, 2011, to September 9, 2011, the Department conducted on-site verifications of RZBC and Yixing Union, respectively. On October 12, 2011, RZBC, Yixing Union, Petitioners, and the Government of the People's Republic of China, Ministry of Commerce, Bureau of Fair Trade for Imports and Exports, submitted case briefs. RZBC, Yixing Union, and Petitioners submitted rebuttal briefs on October 18, 2011.

##### **Period of Review**

The period of review (“POR”) is November 20, 2008, through April 30, 2010.

##### **Scope of the Order**

The scope of the order includes all grades and granulation sizes of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate in their unblended forms, whether dry or in solution, and regardless of packaging type. The scope also includes blends of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate; as well as blends with other ingredients, such as sugar, where the unblended form(s) of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate constitute 40 percent or more, by weight, of the blend. The scope of the order also includes all forms of crude calcium citrate, including dicalcium citrate monohydrate, and tricalcium citrate tetrahydrate, which are intermediate products in the production of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate. The scope of the order does not include calcium citrate that satisfies the standards set forth in the United States Pharmacopeia and has been mixed with a functional excipient, such as dextrose or starch, where the excipient constitutes at least 2 percent, by weight, of the product. The scope of the order includes the hydrous and anhydrous forms of citric acid, the dihydrate and anhydrous forms of sodium citrate, otherwise known as citric acid sodium salt, and the monohydrate and

*Limit for the Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 47146 (August 4, 2011).