

Authority: Pub. L. 94–582, 90 Stat. 2867, as amended (7 U.S.C. 71 *et seq.*).

David R. Shipman,

Acting Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–14817 Filed 9–6–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–KD–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Economic Development Administration

Notice of Petitions by Firms for Determination of Eligibility To Apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance

AGENCY: Economic Development Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice and opportunity for public comment.

Pursuant to Section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2341 *et seq.*), the

Economic Development Administration (EDA) has received petitions for certification of eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance from the firms listed below. EDA has initiated separate investigations to determine whether increased imports into the United States of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by each firm contributed importantly to the total or partial separation of the firm’s workers, or threat thereof, and to a decrease in sales or production of each petitioning firm.

LIST OF PETITIONS RECEIVED BY EDA FOR CERTIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY TO APPLY FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR THE PERIOD JULY 27, 2006 THROUGH AUGUST 30, 2006

Firm	Address	Date petition accepted	Product
GasTech Engineering, Inc	1007 E. Admiral Boulevard, Tulsa, OK 74145.	7/27/06	Oil and gas production equipment.
Norgren, Inc	5400 South Delaware Street, Littleton, CO 80120.	8/4/06	Motion and fluid control equipment.
Mega Manufacturing, Inc	401 S. Washington Street, Hutchinson, KS 67501.	8/4/06	Metal shearing and fabrication machinery.
COBE Cardiovascular, Inc	14401 W 65th Way, Arvada, CO 80004 ..	8/4/06	Electrosurgical products used in open heart surgery.
El Encanto, Inc. dba Bueno Foods (JV) ...	2001 4th Street SW., Albuquerque, NM 87102.	8/7/06	Vegetable products, spices, tortillas.
Valley Oak Cabinets, Inc	7050 97th Plaza Circle, Omaha, NE 68122.	8/14/06	Wood kitchen cabinets and wood doors.
Bra-Vor Tool and Die Company, Inc	11189 Murray Road, Meadville, PA	8/23/06	Stamped metal parts.
Alumina Ceramic Components, Inc	4532 Route 982, Latrobe, PA 15650	8/23/06	Industrial ceramic components.
Capps Shoe Company, Inc	3715 Mayflower Drive, Lynchburg, VA 24501.	8/23/06	Men’s and women’s shoes.
Metal Edge International, Inc	337 West Walnut Street, North Wales, PA 19454.	8/23/06	Specialty packaging products.
National Graphics, Inc	2711 Miami Street, St. Louis, MO 63118	8/29/06	Coated inkjet media.
Discovery Plastics, LLC	3607 28th Avenue, NE., Miami, OK 74354.	8/29/06	Automotive plastic injection molding parts.
George Gordon Associates, Inc	12 Continental Boulevard, Merrimack, NH 03054.	8/29/06	Packing and wrapping machinery.

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 Office of Chief Counsel, Room 7005, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230, no later than ten (10) calendar days following publication of this notice. Please follow the procedures set forth in Section 315.9 of EDA’s interim final rule (70 FR 47002) for procedures for requesting a public hearing. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance official program number and title of the program under which these petitions are submitted is 11.313, Trade Adjustment Assistance.

Dated: August 30, 2006.
Barry Bird,
Chief Counsel.
 [FR Doc. E6–14815 Filed 9–6–06; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–24–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–863]

Honey from the People’s Republic of China: Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 7, 2006.

SUMMARY: On June 21, 2006, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) received a request to

conduct a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on honey from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”) from Shanghai Bloom International Trading Co., Ltd. (“Shanghai Bloom”). We have determined that this request meets the statutory and regulatory requirements for the initiation of a new shipper review.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carrie Blozy or Anya Naschak, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5403 or (202) 482–6375, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department received a timely request from Shanghai Bloom in

accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”) and 19 CFR 351.214(c), for a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on honey from the PRC, which has a December annual anniversary month, and a June semi-annual anniversary month. Shanghai Bloom identified itself as the exporter of honey produced by Linxiang Jindeya Bee-Keeping Co., Ltd. (“Jindeya”). As required by 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(ii) and (b)(2)(ii)(A), Shanghai Bloom certified that it did not export honey to the United States during the period of investigation (“POI”), and that it has never been affiliated with any exporter or producer which exported honey to the United States during the POI. Jindeya also certified that it did not export honey to the United States during the POI, and that it has never been affiliated with any exporter or producer which exported honey to the United States during the POI. Furthermore, the two companies have also certified that their activities are not controlled by the government of the PRC, satisfying the requirements of 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(B). Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iv), Shanghai Bloom submitted documentation establishing the date on which the subject merchandise was first entered for consumption in the United States, the volume of that first shipment and any subsequent shipments, and the date of the first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States.

The Department conducted Customs database queries and analyzed Customs entry packages to confirm that the shipment of Shanghai Bloom had officially entered the United States via assignment of an entry date in the Customs database by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”). In addition, the Department confirmed the existence of Shanghai Bloom and its U.S. customer. We note that although Shanghai Bloom submitted documentation regarding the volume of its shipment, and the date of its first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States, CBP entry documents and our Customs database query show that Shanghai Bloom’s shipment entered the United States shortly after the anniversary month.

Under 19 CFR 351.214(f)(2)(ii), when the sale of the subject merchandise occurs within the period of review (“POR”), but the entry occurs after the normal POR, the POR may be extended unless it would be likely to prevent the completion of the review within the time limits set by the Department’s regulations. The preamble to the Department’s regulations states that both the entry and the sale should occur

during the POR, and that under “appropriate” circumstances the Department has the flexibility to extend the POR. *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27319–27320 (May 19, 1997). In this instance, Shanghai Bloom’s shipment entered in the month following the end of the POR. The Department does not find that this delay prevents the completion of the review within the time limits set by the Department’s regulations.

On June 22, 2006, we requested from CBP the entry package for Shanghai Bloom, and we received the entry documentation from CBP. However, we found certain discrepancies between the documentation provided by Shanghai Bloom in its request for a new shipper review and the entry package we received from CBP.¹ On July 20, 2006, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.302(b), the Department extended the time limit to initiate this new shipper review until August 31, 2006, in order to provide Shanghai Bloom an opportunity to explain or resolve the inconsistencies in the entry documentation.² On August 7, 2006, we received documentation from Shanghai Bloom, including invoice and shipment documentation, to demonstrate that Jindeya was the producer of the subject merchandise, and a revised Producer Certificate, which contains a Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) registration number and lists Jindeya as the producer. Shanghai Bloom explained that listing Shanghai Bloom on the Producer Certificate was an inadvertent error.

On August 9, 2006, the Department issued a letter to Shanghai Bloom, noting that section 801(m) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 381(m)), amended by section 307 of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002, requires prior notification and the use of an FDA registration number, which should be assigned to “the owner, operator, or agent in charge of a domestic or foreign facility that manufactures/processes, packs, or holds food for human or animal consumption in the U.S., or an individual authorized by one of them, must register that facility with FDA”

¹ See Memorandum to the File from Anya Naschak, Senior Case Analyst, through Carrie Blozy, Program Manager, Re: Honey from the People’s Republic of China: Entry Packages from U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”), dated July 20, 2006 (“CBP Memo”).

² See Letter to Shanghai Bloom from Carrie Blozy: Extension of Initiation Date of New Shipper Review of Honey from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”), dated July 20, 2006 (“Initiation Extension Letter”).

(see <http://www.cfsan.fda.gov/dms/fsbtac12.html>), and requesting that Shanghai Bloom submit a copy of the completed online FDA Registration that generated the FDA Registration number appearing on Shanghai Bloom’s Producer Certifications.³ On August 11, 2006, Shanghai Bloom submitted the FDA Registration information, which listed Shanghai Bloom as the foreign facility, and contained the same FDA Registration number appearing on the Producer Certification.

On August 17, 2006, the Department requested that Shanghai Bloom explain the discrepancy between the Producer Certification that lists Jindeya as the producer, and the FDA Registration number that was issued to Shanghai Bloom.⁴ On August 21, 2006, Shanghai Bloom submitted a revised Producer Certification, which listed Jindeya’s recently acquired FDA Registration number, and explained that, due to a misunderstanding of the requirements of the form, Shanghai Bloom inadvertently put its own name and FDA Registration number on the Producer Certificate, but that Jindeya was the actual producer of the merchandise exported to the United States during the POR.

Based on the information submitted by Shanghai Bloom on August 7, 2006, August 11, 2006, and August 21, 2006, we find that Shanghai Bloom has sufficiently demonstrated for purposes of initiation that Jindeya was the producer of the honey it exported to the United States. In the course of this new shipper review, we will further examine this issue.

Initiation of Review

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.214(d)(1), and based on information on the record, we are initiating a new shipper review for Shanghai Bloom. See Memorandum to the File through James C. Doyle, New Shipper Initiation Checklist, dated August 25, 2006. The Department will conduct this new shipper review according to the deadlines set forth in section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(g)(1)(i)(B), the POR for a new

³ See Letter to Shanghai Bloom from Carrie Blozy: Request for Clarification on Shanghai Bloom International Trading Co., Ltd.’s Request for Initiation of a New Shipper Review of Honey from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”), dated August 9, 2006.

⁴ See Letter to Shanghai Bloom from Carrie Blozy: Request for Clarification on Shanghai Bloom International Trading Co., Ltd.’s Request for Initiation of a New Shipper Review of Honey from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”), dated August 17, 2006.

shipper review, initiated in the month immediately following the semi-annual anniversary month, will be the six-month period immediately preceding the semi-annual anniversary month. As discussed above, under 19 CFR 351.214(f)(2)(ii), when the sale of the subject merchandise occurs within the POR, but the entry occurs after the normal POR, the POR may be extended. Therefore, the POR for the new shipper review of Shanghai Bloom is December 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006.

Pursuant to the Department's regulations, in cases involving non-market economies, the Department requires that a company seeking to establish eligibility for an antidumping duty rate separate from the country-wide rate provide evidence of *de jure* and *de facto* absence of government control over the company's export activities. Accordingly, we will issue a questionnaire to Shanghai Bloom, including a separate rates section. The review will proceed if the responses provide sufficient indication that Shanghai Bloom is not subject to either *de jure* or *de facto* government control with respect to its exports of honey. However, if Shanghai Bloom does not demonstrate its eligibility for a separate rate, then the company will be deemed not separate from other companies that exported during the POI and the new shipper review will be rescinded as to Shanghai Bloom.

On August 17, 2006, the Pension Protection Act of 2006 (H.R. 4) was signed into law. Section 1632 of H.R. 4 temporarily suspends the authority of the Department to instruct CBP to collect a bond or other security in lieu of a cash deposit in new shipper reviews. Therefore, the posting of a bond under Section 751(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act in lieu of a cash deposit is not available in this case. Importers of subject merchandise exported by Shanghai Bloom and manufactured by Jindeya must continue to post a cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties on each entry of subject merchandise at the current PRC-wide rate of 212.39 percent.

Interested parties that need access to proprietary information in this new shipper review should submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306.

This initiation notice is issued and published in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act and sections 351.214(d) and 351.221(c)(1)(i) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: August 30, 2006.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-14846 Filed 9-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-841]

Structural Steel Beams from Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from the Committee for Fair Beam Imports, Nucor Corp., Nucor-Yamato Steel Co., Steel Dynamics, Inc. and TXI-Chaparral Steel Co., (collectively, petitioners), INI Steel Company (INI), and Dongkuk Steel Mill Co., Ltd. (DSM), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on structural steel beams from the Republic of Korea (Korea). This review covers INI and DSM, manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review (POR) is August 1, 2004 through July 31, 2005.

We preliminarily determine that INI has sold subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV) during the POR. We also preliminarily determine that DSM has not sold subject merchandise at less than NV. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this segment of the proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) A statement of the issue, (2) a brief summary of the argument and (3) a table of authorities.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 7, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maryanne Burke or Steve Bezirgianian, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Room 7866, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-5604 or (202) 482-1131 respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 1, 2005 the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on structural steel beams from Korea. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 70 FR 44085 (August 1, 2005). On August 31, 2005 petitioners requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of DSM, a Korean producer of subject merchandise. Also, on August 31, 2005, DSM and INI requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of their sales of subject merchandise during the POR. On September 28, 2005 the Department published a notice of initiation of a review of structural steel beams from Korea covering the period August 1, 2004 through July 31, 2005. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 70 FR 56631 (September 28, 2005). On October 3, 2005 the Department issued its antidumping duty questionnaires to INI and to DSM.

Because we disregarded sales of certain products made by INI at prices below the cost of production (COP) in what was, at that time, the most recently completed review of structural steel beams from Korea (*see Structural Steel Beams from Korea; Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 70 FR 6837 (February 9, 2005)), we had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect INI made sales of the foreign like product at prices below the COP, as provided by section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act). Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Tariff Act, from the outset of this review we required INI to respond to section D of the questionnaire. On November 4, 2005, the Department granted approval of INI's October 12, 2005 request to shift its cost reporting period for section D. The Department had not disregarded sales of structural steel beams made by DSM at prices below the COP in the most recently completed review of DSM; therefore, DSM was not initially required to respond to section D of the questionnaire. However, on December 19, 2005 petitioners alleged that DSM sold the foreign like product at prices below its COP. On January 9, 2006, the Department initiated a cost investigation of DSM based upon the determination that petitioners' allegation established reasonable grounds to believe or suspect sales below cost, and instructed DSM to