

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2), we determine that it is not practicable to complete the results of this review within the original time limit. The Department needs additional time to analyze a significant amount of information, which was recently submitted, and to determine whether any additional information is required. Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department has decided to extend the time limit for the preliminary results from 245 days to 365 days. The preliminary results will now be due no later than December 7, 2010. Unless extended, the final results continue to be due 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(1) of the Department's regulations.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(3)(A) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 1, 2010.

**John M. Andersen,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2010-13730 Filed 6-7-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-831]

#### **Fresh Garlic From the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of the New Shipper Reviews**

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

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* June 8, 2010.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Scott Lindsay, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0780.

#### **Background**

On December 29, 2009, the Department of Commerce (Department) initiated new shipper reviews of fresh garlic from the People's Republic of China (PRC) for Jinxiang Chengda Imp & Exp Co., Ltd. (Chengda), Jinxiang Yuanxin Imp & Exp Co., Ltd. (Yuanxin), and Zhengzhou Huachao Industrial Co., Ltd. (Huachao) covering the period November 1, 2008 through October 31,

2009. *See Fresh Garlic from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of New Shipper Reviews*, 75 FR 343 (January 5, 2010). On February 12, 2010, the Department issued a memorandum that tolled the deadlines for all Import Administration cases by seven calendar days due to the Federal Government closure. *See Memorandum for the Record from Ronald Lorentzen, DAS for Import Administration, Tolling of Administrative Deadlines as a Result of the Government Closure During the Recent Snowstorm*, dated February 12, 2010. As a result, the preliminary results of these new shipper reviews are currently due no later than July 6, 2010.

#### **Statutory Time Limits**

Section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), provides that the Department will issue the preliminary results of a new shipper review of an antidumping duty order within 180 days after the day on which the review was initiated. *See also* 19 CFR 351.214(i)(1). The Act further provides that the Department may extend that 180-day period to 300 days if it determines that the case is extraordinarily complicated. *See* 19 CFR 351.214(i)(2).

#### **Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results**

The Department determines that these new shipper reviews involve extraordinarily complicated methodological issues, including the examination of importer information. Additional time is also required to ensure that the Department has adequate time to include Chengda, Yuanxin, and Huachao's supplemental questionnaire responses in its examination of the *bona fides* of the companies' sales. Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(2), the Department is extending the time limit for these preliminary results to 300 days, until no later than November 1, 2010.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: June 1, 2010.

**John M. Andersen,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2010-13731 Filed 6-7-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[C-570-948]

#### **Certain Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination**

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) has determined that countervailable subsidies are being provided to producers and exporters of steel grating from the People's Republic of China (PRC). For information on the estimated countervailable subsidy rates, please see the "Suspension of Liquidation" section, below.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 8, 2010.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Justin Neuman or Nicholas Czajkowski AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0486, (202) 482-1395, respectively.

#### **Petitioners**

Petitioners in this investigation are Alabama Metal Industries Corp. (AMICO) and Fisher & Ludlow (collectively, "Petitioners").

#### **Period of Investigation**

The period for which we are measuring subsidies, *i.e.*, the period of investigation (POI), is January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2008.

#### **Case History**

The following events have occurred since the preliminary determination. *See Certain Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Alignment of Final Countervailing Duty Determination with Final Antidumping Duty Determination*, 74 FR 56796 (November 3, 2009) (*Preliminary Determination*).

The Department issued several supplemental questionnaires to the Government of the People's Republic of China (GOC) and Ningbo Jiulong Machinery Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Ningbo Jiulong). The Department received responses to questionnaires issued to the GOC in December 2009, as well as in January and February 2010. The Department received responses to questionnaires issued to Ningbo Jiulong in December 2009, as well as in January, February, and March 2010. Public versions of the questionnaires and

responses, as well as the various memoranda cited below, are available in the Department's Central Records Unit (Room 1117 in the HCHB Building) (hereinafter referred to as the CRU).

As explained in the Memorandum from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, the Department has exercised its discretion to toll deadlines for the duration of the closure of the Federal Government from February 5, through February 12, 2010. Thus, all deadlines in this segment of the proceeding have been extended by seven days. The revised deadline for this final CVD determination is now May 28, 2010. See Memorandum to the Record from Ronald K. Lorentzen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, regarding "Tolling of Administrative Deadlines As a Result of the Government Closure During the Recent Snowstorm" (February 12, 2010).

On February 24, 2010, Department officials met with Petitioners' counsel to discuss issues related to the upcoming verification of the GOC and Ningbo Jiulong. See Memorandum for the File from Nicholas Czajkowski, Case Analyst, AD/CVD Operations, Meeting with Counsel for Petitioners: *Countervailing Duty Investigation on Certain Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China* (February 26, 2010).

On March 8, 2010, Petitioners placed on the record a detailed analysis of mill test certificates that were provided to the Department by Ningbo Jiulong. See Letter to Secretary Locke from Timothy C. Brightbill, *Certain Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China: Comments on Mill Test Certificates* (March 8, 2010).

From March 8 through March 13, 2010, we conducted verification of the questionnaire responses submitted by the GOC and Ningbo Jiulong. We issued verification reports on April 14, 2010. See Memorandum to the File from Thomas Beline, Staff Attorney; Nicholas Czajkowski, International Trade Analyst; and Justin Neuman, International Trade Analyst, *Verification of the Questionnaire Responses Submitted by the Government of China* (April 14, 2010), and Memorandum to the File from Thomas Beline, Staff Attorney; Nicholas Czajkowski, International Trade Analyst; and Justin Neuman, International Trade Analyst, *Verification of the Questionnaire Responses Submitted by Ningbo Jiulong Machinery Manufacturing Co., Ltd. and Ningbo Zhenhai Jiulong Electronic Equipment Factory* (April 14, 2010) (*Ningbo Jiulong Verification Report*).

On March 15, 2010, Ningbo Jiulong filed a copy of the minor corrections

provided to the Department at verification. See Letter to Secretary Locke from Gregory S. Menegaz, *Certain Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China – Minor Corrections – Ningbo Jiulong* (March 15, 2010).

On March 23, 2010, we requested permission from Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to place on the record certain entry documents that it had provided for the record in the corresponding antidumping (AD) investigation. See Memorandum to Tom Futtner, Supervisory Import Compliance Analyst, Customs Unit, Import Administration from Nicholas Czajkowski, International Trade Analyst, Office 6, *Countervailing Duty Investigation of Certain Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China: Request for Customs Documents* (March 23, 2010). Those documents were placed on the record on April 6, 2010. See Memorandum to the File from Nicholas Czajkowski, Trade Analyst, Office 6, AD/CVD Operations, *Countervailing Duty Investigation of Certain Steel Grating (CSG) from the People's Republic of China (PRC): CBP Entry Documents* (April 6, 2010).

On March 23, 2010, we issued a letter establishing a deadline for parties to rebut factual information recently added to the record. See Letter to Ningbo Jiulong from Barbara E. Tillman, Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, *Countervailing Duty Investigation; Certain Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China* (March 23, 2010).

On March 23, 2010, Ningbo Jiulong filed clarifying and rebuttal comments related to Petitioners' March 8, 2010 analysis of mill test certificates provided by Ningbo Jiulong to the Department. See Letter to Secretary Locke from Ningbo Jiulong, *Steel Grating from China – Ningbo Jiulong Machinery Manufacturing Co. Ltd. and Ningbo Zhenhai Jiulong Electronic Equipment Factory – Rebuttal to Petitioners' March 8, 2010 Submission* (March 24, 2010).

On April 15, 2010, we issued our post-preliminary determination regarding the "Provision of Electricity for Less than Adequate Remuneration." See Memorandum to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration from John M. Andersen, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Operations, *Countervailing Duty Investigation of Certain Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China (PRC): Post-Preliminary Determination Regarding the Provision of Electricity for Less than Adequate Remuneration* (April 15, 2010).

On April 23, 2010, we received comments from Ningbo Jiulong regarding what it considers to be several

significant errors in the *Ningbo Jiulong Verification Report* issued by the Department on April 14, 2010, and urging the Department not to let those errors color its analysis for the purposes of the final determination.

On April 26, 2010, we received case briefs from Petitioners, the GOC, Ningbo Jiulong, and Yantai Xinke Steel Structure Co., Ltd. (an exporter/producer of steel grating that was not selected as a mandatory respondent in this investigation). On April 28, the Department issued a letter rejecting Petitioners' brief because it contained new factual information. See Letter to AMICO and Fisher & Ludlow from Barbara E. Tillman, Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, *Rejection of New Factual Information Submitted in Case Brief Dated April 26, 2010*. Petitioners resubmitted their brief on April 29, 2010. Rebuttal briefs were submitted by Petitioners, the GOC, and Ningbo Jiulong on May 3, 2010.

On May 4, 2010, Ningbo Jiulong withdrew its request for a hearing. On May 6, 2010, Department officials met with representatives of Ningbo Jiulong regarding issues in the briefs submitted by their client and by Petitioners. See Memorandum for the File from Justin M. Neuman, International Trade Analyst, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, *Ex-Parte Meeting with Representatives of Ningbo Jiulong Machinery Manufacturing Co., Ltd.* (May 10, 2010). On May 10, 2010, Department officials met with Petitioners' counsel to discuss issues related to the briefs. See Memorandum for the File from Justin M. Neuman, International Trade Analyst, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, *Countervailing Duty Investigation of Certain Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China: Ex-Parte Meeting with Representatives of Alabama Metal Industries, Fisher and Ludlow* (May 19, 2010).

#### Scope of the Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are certain steel grating, consisting of two or more pieces of steel, including load-bearing pieces and cross pieces, joined by any assembly process, regardless of: (1) size or shape; (2) method of manufacture; (3) metallurgy (carbon, alloy, or stainless); (4) the profile of the bars; and (5) whether or not they are galvanized, painted, coated, clad or plated. Steel grating is also commonly referred to as "bar grating," although the components may consist of steel other than bars, such as hot-rolled sheet, plate, or wire rod.

The scope of this investigation excludes expanded metal grating, which

is comprised of a single piece or coil of sheet or thin plate steel that has been slit and expanded, and does not involve welding or joining of multiple pieces of steel. The scope of this investigation also excludes plank type safety grating which is comprised of a single piece or coil of sheet or thin plate steel, typically in thickness of 10 to 18 gauge, that has been pierced and cold formed, and does not involve welding or joining of multiple pieces of steel.

Certain steel grating that is the subject of this investigation is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”) under subheading 7308.90.7000. While the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

**Injury Test**

Because the PRC is a “Subsidies Agreement Country” within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the International Trade Commission (ITC) is required to determine, pursuant to section 701(a)(2) of the Act, whether imports of the subject merchandise from the PRC materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. On July 20, 2009, the ITC published its preliminary determination that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of allegedly subsidized imports from the PRC of subject merchandise. See *Certain Steel Grating From China Determinations*, 74 FR 35204 (July 20, 2009); and *Certain Steel Grating from China (Preliminary)*, USITC Pub. 4087, Inv. Nos. 701–TA–465 and 731–TA–1161 (July 2009).

**Analysis of Subsidy Programs and Comments Received**

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this investigation are addressed in the Memorandum to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, from John M. Andersen, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, entitled “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Determination in the Countervailing Duty Investigation of Certain Steel Grating from the People’s Republic of China,” dated concurrently with this notice (hereinafter, *Decision Memorandum*), which is hereby adopted by this notice. Attached to this notice as an Appendix is a list of the issues that parties have raised and to which we have responded in the

*Decision Memorandum*. The *Decision Memorandum* also contains a complete analysis of the programs covered by this investigation, and the methodologies used to calculate the subsidy rates. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this investigation and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room 1117 in the main building of the Commerce Department. In addition, a complete version of the *Decision Memorandum* can be accessed directly on the Internet at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/>. The paper copy and electronic version of the *Decision Memorandum* are identical in content.

**Use of Adverse Facts Available**

For purposes of this final determination, we have relied on facts available and drawn adverse inferences, in accordance with sections 776(a) and (b) of the Act, with regard to Ningbo Jiulong’s receipt of countervailable subsidies under the “Provision of Hot-Rolled Steel for Less than Adequate Remuneration” and “Provision of Wire Rod for Less than Adequate Remuneration” programs. A full discussion of our decision to apply partial adverse facts available (AFA) is presented in the *Decision Memorandum* in the section “Application of Facts Available, Including the Application of Adverse Inferences,” as well as the Department’s position on Comment 4 in the *Decision Memorandum*.

With respect to the GOC’s “Provision of Electricity for Less than Adequate Remuneration,” the Department has also relied upon facts available and drawn adverse inferences, in accordance with sections 776(a) and (b) of the Act. A full discussion of our decision to apply partial AFA is presented in the section “Application of Facts Available, Including the Application of Adverse Inferences,” and the Department’s position on Comment 10 of the *Decision Memorandum*.

**Suspension of Liquidation**

In accordance with section 705(c)(1)(B)(i)(I) of the Act, we have calculated an individual rate for the mandatory respondent under investigation, Ningbo Jiulong Machinery Manufacturing Co., Ltd. Section 705(c)(5)(A)(i) of the Act states that for companies not investigated, we will determine an “all others” rate equal to the weighted-average countervailable subsidy rates established for exporters and producers individually investigated, excluding any zero and *de minimis* countervailable subsidy rates,

and any rates determined entirely under section 776 of the Act. In this investigation, the Department selected two mandatory respondents to review. After receiving and reviewing the questionnaire responses of one of the mandatory respondents, United Steel Structures, Ltd. (USSL), the Department determined that, because USSL was not a steel grating exporter or producer, it would be an inappropriate mandatory respondent in this investigation. See Memorandum to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration from John M. Andersen, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Operations, *Countervailing Duty Investigation of Certain Steel Grating from the People’s Republic of China: Whether USSL Should be Maintained as a Mandatory Respondent*. However, because that determination was made on October 23, 2009, three days before the preliminary determination, the Department determined that it could not select an additional mandatory respondent to calculate an individual rate for in this investigation. Because there is only one respondent in this investigation for which the Department has calculated a company-specific rate, consistent with our practice and section 705(c)(5)(A)(i) of the Act, its rate serves as the “all others” rate. See e.g., *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Thailand*, 66 FR 50410, 50411 (October 3, 2001); and *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Pure Magnesium From Israel*, 66 FR 49351, 49353 (Sept. 27, 2001).

Exporter/Manufacturer	Net Countervailable Subsidy Rate
Ningbo Jiulong Machinery Manufacturing Co., Ltd. ...	62.46% <i>ad valorem</i>
All Others .....	62.46% <i>ad valorem</i>

As a result of our *Preliminary Determination*, we instructed CBP to suspend liquidation of all entries of steel grating from the PRC which were entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after November 3, 2009, the date of the publication of the *Preliminary Determination* in the **Federal Register** and to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties or bonds, in the amount of the preliminary countervailing duty rates.

Pursuant to section 703(d) of the Act, we subsequently instructed CBP to discontinue the suspension of liquidation for countervailing duty

purposes for subject merchandise entered on or after March 3, 2010, but to continue the suspension of liquidation of entries made on or after November 3, 2009 through March 2, 2010.

If the ITC issues a final affirmative injury determination, we will issue a countervailing duty order and order CBP to resume the suspension of liquidation of entries of steel grating and to require a cash deposit on all such entries equal to the subsidy rate listed above. If the ITC determines that material injury, or threat of material injury, does not exist, this proceeding will be terminated and all deposits or securities posted as a result of the suspension of liquidation will be refunded or canceled.

#### ITC Notification

In accordance with section 705(d) of the Act, we will notify the ITC of our determination. In addition, we are making available to the ITC all non-privileged and non-proprietary information related to this investigation. We will allow the ITC access to all privileged and business proprietary information in our files, provided the ITC confirms that it will not disclose such information, either publicly or under an APO, without the written consent of the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

#### Return or Destruction of Proprietary Information

In the event that the ITC issues a final negative injury determination, this notice will serve as the only reminder to parties subject to an administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

This determination is issued and published pursuant to sections 705(d) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: May 28, 2010.

**Paul Piquado,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

#### Appendix

##### I. Summary

##### II. Background

##### III. Subsidies Valuation

- A. *Date of Applicability of CVD Law to the PRC*
- B. *Allocation Period*
- C. *Cross-Ownership*

##### IV. Application of Facts Available, Including the Application of Adverse Inferences

##### V. Analysis of Programs

##### A. Programs Determined to Be Countervailable

1. Government Provision of Hot-Rolled Steel for Less than Adequate Remuneration
2. Government Provision of Wire Rod for Less than Adequate Remuneration
3. Income Tax Credits for Domestically Owned Companies Purchasing Domestically Produced Equipment
4. Government Provision of Electricity for Less than Adequate Remuneration
5. Other Grant Programs
  - a) Export Grant 2006, 2007, 2008
  - b) Jiulong Lake Town Grant 2008
  - c) Energy Saving Grant 2008
  - d) Foreign Trade Grant 2008
  - e) Famous Brand Grant 2008
  - f) Innovative Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprise Grant 2008
  - g) Water Fund Refund/Exemption 2008
  - h) Product Quality Grant

##### B. Program Determined To Be Not Countervailable

*Cleaning Production Grant 2008*

##### C. Programs Determined To Be Not Used or To Not Provide Benefits During the POI

1. *GOC Provision of Steel Bar for Less than Adequate Remuneration*
2. *GOC Provision of Steel Plate for Less than Adequate Remuneration*
3. *GOC Provision of Land-Use Rights to SOEs for Less than Adequate Remuneration*
4. *“Two Free, Three Half” Program*
5. *Reduced Income Tax Rates for Export-Oriented FIEs*
6. *Preferential Income Tax Policy for Enterprises in the Northeast Region*
7. *Forgiveness of Tax Arrears for Enterprises in the Old Industrial Bases of Northeast China*

8. *Tax Subsidies for FIEs in Specially Designated Geographic Areas*
9. *Local Income Tax Exemption and Reduction Programs for “Productive” FIEs*
10. *Income Tax Credits for FIEs Purchasing Domestically Produced Equipment*
11. *Preferential Tax Programs for FIEs Recognized as High or New Technology Enterprises*
12. *Import Tariff and Value Added Tax (“VAT”) Exemptions for Encouraged Industries Importing Equipment for Domestic Operations*
13. *VAT and Tariff Exemptions for Purchases of Fixed Assets Under the Foreign Trade Development Fund*
14. *Loans and Interest Subsidies Provided Pursuant to the Northeast Revitalization Program*
15. *Grants to “Third-Line” Military Enterprises*
16. *Guangdong and Zhejiang Province Program to Rebate Antidumping Fees*
17. *The State Key Technology Project Fund*
18. *Export Incentive Payments Characterized as “VAT Rebates”*
19. *VAT Refunds for FIEs Purchasing Domestically-Produced Equipment*
20. *Technical Upgrading Grant 2005, 2007*
21. *Power Engine Grant 2005*
22. *Technical Innovation Grant 2006*

##### D. Programs For Which Ningbo Jiulong Is Determined to Be Ineligible

1. *Liaoning Province “Five Points, One Line” Program*
2. *Guangzhou City Famous Exports Brands*
3. *Grants to Companies for “Outward Expansion” in Guangdong Province*

#### IV. Analysis of Comments

*Comment 1:* Application of U.S. Countervailing Duty Law to China

*Comment 2:* Cut-Off Date

*Comment 3:* Selection of Two Mandatory Respondents

*Comment 4:* Application of Adverse Facts Available

*Comment 5:* Department Procedures

*Comment 6:* Provision of Hot-Rolled Steel and Wire Rod for Less than Adequate Remuneration – The Role of Mill Test Certificates

*Comment 7:* Provision of Hot-Rolled Steel and Wire Rod for Less than Adequate Remuneration – Whether These Programs Are Countervailable

*Comment 8:* Provision of Hot-Rolled Steel and Wire Rod for Less than Adequate Remuneration – Appropriate Benchmark

*Comment 9: Income Tax Credits for Domestically Owned Companies Purchasing Domestically Produced Equipment*

*Comment 10: Provision of Electricity for Less than Adequate Remuneration*

*Comment 11: Grant Programs*

*Comment 12: Separate CVD Rate for Xinke*

## VII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2010-13776 Filed 6-7-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-947]

#### Certain Steel Grating From the People's Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value

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

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* June 8, 2010.

**SUMMARY:** On January 6, 2010, the Department of Commerce ("Department") published its preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value ("LTFV") in the antidumping duty investigation of certain steel grating ("steel grating") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). See *Certain Steel Grating From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination*, 75 FR 847 (January 6, 2010) ("*Preliminary Determination*"). We invited interested parties to comment on our preliminary determination of sales at LTFV. Based on our analysis of the comments we received, we have made changes from the *Preliminary Determination*. We determine that steel grating from the PRC is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at LTFV as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("Act"). The final dumping margins for this investigation are listed in the "Final Determination Margins" section below.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas Martin, 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) 482-3936.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Case History

The period of investigation ("POI") is October 1, 2008, through March 31, 2009. The Department published its preliminary determination of sales at LTFV on January 6, 2010. See *Preliminary Determination*. On February 4, 2010, we postponed the final determination. See *Certain Steel Grating From the People's Republic of China: Postponement of Final Determination*, 75 FR 5766 (February 4, 2010).

As explained in the memorandum from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, the Department has exercised its discretion to toll deadlines for the duration of the closure of the Federal Government from February 5, through February 12, 2010. Thus, all deadlines in this segment of the proceeding have been extended by seven days. The revised deadline for the final determination of this investigation is now May 28, 2010. See Memorandum to the Record from Ronald Lorentzen, DAS for Import Administration, regarding "Tolling of Administrative Deadlines As a Result of the Government Closure During the Recent Snowstorm," dated February 12, 2010.

Between January 11, 2010, through January 15, 2010, the Department conducted verification of Ningbo Jiulong Machinery Manufacturing Co., Ltd. and Ningbo Zhenhai Jiulong Electronic Equipment Factory (collectively "Ningbo Jiulong"). See the "Verification" section below for additional information. On March 8, 2010, Fisher & Ludlow and Alabama Metal Industries Corporation (hereafter referred to as "Petitioners") filed comments regarding mill test certificates from Ningbo Jiulong's suppliers of steel coils and wire rod that were included in the Department's verification exhibits. Petitioners cited numerous aspects of the mill test certificates that they deemed irregular, and which indicated that the mill test certificates were not genuine.

On March 8, 2010, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire to Ningbo Jiulong, requiring a response to Petitioners' analysis and specific allegations, and to reconcile its suppliers' mill test certificates with other information on the record. On March 9, 2010, the Department requested additional information from Petitioners, supporting the analysis in its March 8, 2010 submission. Also, on March 9, 2010, the Department requested U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") entry documents pertaining to certain Ningbo Jiulong shipments, specifically any mill test certificates filed by the importer of

record. On March 10, 2010, the Department issued an additional request to Ningbo Jiulong to provide mill test certificates for its steel inputs for certain specific U.S. sales of steel grating that the Department had selected for specific review at verification.

On March 16, 2010, and March 18, 2010, the Department received from CBP entry documentation and certain mill test certificates created by Ningbo Jiulong for steel coils, filed with CBP by the importer of record.

On March 18, 2010, Ningbo Jiulong responded to the Department's March 10, 2010, request for specific mill test certificates by stating that (1) Ningbo Jiulong could not link steel coil mill test certificates to the U.S. sales of steel grating in which the steel coil was used in production, and (2) in practice Ningbo Jiulong did not provide mill test certificates to its customer for most sales, despite the "legalistic terms in the small print" of its purchase orders.

On March 19, 2010, Petitioners responded to the Department's request with supporting information concerning the analysis in their March 8, 2010 submission. Also, on March 19, 2010, Ningbo Jiulong responded to the Department's supplemental questionnaire, stating: (1) Ningbo Jiulong cannot trace any of its suppliers' mill test certificates to specific purchases of steel coil or wire rod, because mill test certificates are production records that pertain to steel sold to multiple customers; (2) mill test certificates are not accounting records (e.g., invoices, inventory slips, delivery notes), and thus Ningbo Jiulong does not keep mill test certificates in its records in the normal course of business; (3) Ningbo Jiulong creates its own mill test certificates that it admits are unreliable, and that it has no ability to determine with its own analysis the chemical properties of any steel that it purchases; and (4) irregularities in the mill test certificates noted by Petitioners are due to the carelessness of their suppliers and/or "estimations" made by its suppliers using the content of prior mill test certificates.

On April 5, 2010, Petitioners, Ningbo Jiulong, and the Government of China submitted case briefs. On April 12, 2010, Petitioners, Ningbo Jiulong, Ningbo Haitian International Co. Ltd. ("Haitian"), and Yantai Xinke Steel Structure Co., Ltd. ("Xinke") submitted rebuttal briefs. On April 19, 2010, the Department held a public hearing.

#### Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this investigation are addressed in the