DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Telecommunications and Information Administration
[Docket No. 100921457–0561–02]
RIN 0660–XA20
Global Free Flow of Information on the Internet
AGENCY: National Telecommunications and Information Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.
ACTION: Notice of Inquiry; reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce’s Internet Policy Task Force announces that the closing deadline for submission of comments responsive to the September 29, 2010 notice of inquiry on the global free flow of information on the Internet has been reopened and will extend until 5 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST) on December 6, 2010.

DATES: Comments are due by 5 p.m. EST on December 6, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties are encouraged to file comments electronically by e-mail to freeflow-noi-2010@ntia.doc.gov. Submissions should be in one of the following formats: HTML, ASCII, Word, rtf, or pdf. Paper comments can be sent to: National Telecommunications and Information Administration at U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room 4701, Washington, DC 20230. Please note that all material sent via the U.S. Postal Service (including “Overnight” or “Express Mail”) is subject to delivery delays of up to two weeks due to mail security procedures. Paper submissions should also include a CD or DVD in Word, WordPerfect, or pdf format. CDs or DVDs should be labeled with the name and organizational affiliation of the filer, and the name of the word processing program used to create the document. Comments filed in response to this notice will be made available to the public on the Internet Policy Task Force Web page at http://www.ntia.doc.gov/internetpolicynotaskforce. For this reason, comments should not include confidential, proprietary, or business sensitive information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general questions about this amended Notice, contact: Chris Hemmerlein, Office of International Affairs, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room 4706, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–1885; e-mail chemmerlein@ntia.doc.gov. Please direct media inquiries to NTIA’s Office of Public Affairs at (202) 482–7002; or USPTO’s Office of Public Affairs at (572) 272–8400.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 21, 2010, the Department of Commerce (the “Department”) announced the formation of a Commerce-wide Internet Policy Task Force (“Task Force”) to identify leading public policy and operational issues impacting the U.S. private sector’s ability to realize the potential for economic growth and job creation through the Internet. On September 29, 2010, the Task Force issued a notice of inquiry on restrictions placed upon the free flow of information on the Internet with a closing date for comments of November 15, 2010. In the interest of affording parties more time to submit comments, the Task Force is reopening the comment period. The Task Force announces that the closing deadline for submission of comments responsive to the September 29, 2010 notice is extended until 5 p.m. on December 6, 2010.

Dated: November 12, 2010.
Lawrence E. Strickling,
Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information

BILLING CODE 3510–60–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
[A–570–970]
Multilayered Wood Flooring From the People’s Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation

DATES: Effective Date: November 18, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brandon Petelin, John Hollwitz or Charles Riggle, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, (202) 482–8173, (202) 482–2336 or (202) 482–0650, respectively; Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.


On November 4, 2010, we received comments from Lumber Liquidators Services, LLC (“Lumber Liquidators”) and Home Legend, LLC (“Home Legend”), U.S. importers of multilayered wood flooring. Lumber Liquidators and Home Legend are interested parties as defined by section 771(9)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”). Additionally, on November 9, 2010, we received further comments filed by Lumber Liquidators, Home Legend and U.S. Floors LLC.

Period of Investigation

1 The Coalition for American Hardwood Parity is comprised of Anderson Hardwood Floors, LLC, Award Hardwood Floors, Baker’s Creek Wood Floors, Inc., From the Forest, Howell Hardwood Flooring, Mannington Mills, Inc., Nydree Flooring and Shaw Industries Group, Inc.


3 See Supplement to the Petition for the Imposition of Anti-dumping and Countervailing Duties: Multilayered Wood Flooring from the People’s Republic of China, dated November 2, 2010 (“Supplement to the AD/CVD Petitions”).


In accordance with section 732(b) of the Act, Petitioner alleged that imports of multilayered wood flooring from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because Petitioner is an interested party, as defined in sections 771(9)(C), (E) and (F) of the Act, and has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the antidumping duty investigation that Petitioner is requesting the Department to initiate (see “Determination of Industry Support for the Petition” section below).

Scope of the Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are multilayered wood flooring from the PRC. For a full description of the scope of the investigation, see “Scope of Investigation,” in Appendix I of this notice.

Comments on Scope of the Investigation

During our review of the Petition, we discussed the scope with Petitioner to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. As a result, the “Scope of Investigation” language has been modified from the language in the Petition to reflect these clarifications. Moreover, as discussed in the preamble to the regulations (see Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997)), we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages interested parties to submit such comments by Tuesday, November 30, 2010, which is twenty calendar days from the signature date of this notice. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration’s APO/Dockets Unit, Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and to consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination.

Comments on Product Characteristics for Antidumping Duty Questionnaires

We are requesting comments from interested parties regarding the appropriate physical characteristics of multilayered wood flooring to be reported in response to the Department’s antidumping questionnaires. This information will be used to identify the key physical characteristics of the merchandise under consideration in order to more accurately report the relevant factors and costs of production, as well as to develop appropriate product comparison criteria.

Interested parties may provide information or comments that they believe are relevant to the development of an accurate listing of physical characteristics. Specifically, they may provide comments as to which characteristics are appropriate to use as: (1) General product characteristics; and (2) the product comparison criteria. We note that it is not always appropriate to use all product characteristics as product comparison criteria. We base product comparison criteria on meaningful commercial differences among products. In other words, while there may be some physical product characteristics utilized by manufacturers to describe multilayered wood flooring, it may be that only a select few product characteristics take into account commercially meaningful physical characteristics. In addition, interested parties may comment on the order in which the physical characteristics should be used in product matching. Generally, the Department attempts to list the most important physical characteristics first and the least important characteristics last.

In order to consider the suggestions of interested parties in developing and issuing the antidumping duty questionnaires, we must receive comments at the above-referenced address by November 30, 2010. Additionally, rebuttal comments must be received by December 7, 2010.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (i) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (ii) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall: (i) Poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition, as required by subparagraph (A); or (ii) determine industry support using a statistically valid sampling method to poll the industry.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the “industry” as the producers as a whole of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The ITC, which is responsible for determining whether the “domestic industry” has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product (see section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department’s determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law. See USEC, Inc. v. United States, 132 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8 (CIT 2001), citing Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd. v. United States, 688 F. Supp. 639, 644 (CIT 1989), aff’d 865 F.2d 569 (Fed. Cir. 1989), cert. denied 492 U.S. 919 (1989).

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as “a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title.” Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is “the article subject to an investigation” (i.e., the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition).

With regard to the domestic like product, Petitioner does not offer a definition of domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigation. Based on our analysis of the information submitted on the record, we have determined that multilayered wood flooring constitutes a single domestic like product and we have analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product. For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis in this case, see Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Multilayered Wood Flooring from the
People’s Republic of China (“Initiation Checklist”), at Attachment II. Analysis of Industry Support for the Petitions Covering Multilayered Wood Flooring from the People’s Republic of China, on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU), Room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building.

In determining whether Petitioner has standing under section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we considered the industry support data contained in the Petition with reference to the domestic like product as defined in the “Scope of Investigation” section above. To establish industry support, Petitioner provided its production volume of the domestic like product in 2009, and compared this to the estimated total production volume of the domestic like product for the entire domestic industry. See Volume I of the Petitions, at 4–5, and Exhibit I–3; see also Supplement to the AD/CVD Petitions dated November 2, 2010, at 2; Second Supplement to the AD/CVD Petitions dated November 3, 2010, at 1–2 and Exhibit I–1. Petitioner estimated 2009 production volume of the domestic like product by non-petitioning companies based on its knowledge of the industry. We have relied upon data Petitioner provided for purposes of measuring industry support. For further discussion, see Initiation Checklist at Attachment II.

On November 4, 2010, we received a submission on behalf of importers of multilayered wood flooring, interested parties to this proceeding as defined in section 771(9)(A) of the Act, questioning the industry support calculation. See Initiation Checklist at Attachment II. On November 8 and 9, 2010, Petitioner filed replies to the importers’ industry support challenge. The importers filed an additional submission on November 9, 2010. For further discussion of these submissions see Initiation Checklist at Attachment II.

Based on information provided in the Petition, supplemental submissions, and other information readily available to the Department, we determine that the domestic producers and workers have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product. Because the Petition and supplemental submissions did not establish support from domestic producers (or workers) accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department was required to take further action in order to evaluate industry support. See section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act. In this case, the Department was able to rely on other information, in accordance with section 732(c)(4)(D)(i) of the Act, to determine industry support. See Initiation Checklist at Attachment II; see also Memorandum to the File from Victoria Flynn, dated November 3, 2010. Based on information provided in the Petition, other submissions, and additional information obtained by the Department, the domestic producers and workers have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the Petition. Accordingly, the Department determines that the Petition was filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act. See Initiation Checklist at Attachment II.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because they are interested parties as defined in section 771(9)(C), (E) and (F) of the Act and they have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the antidumping duty investigations that they are requesting the Department initiate. Id.

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

Petitioner alleges that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of the imports of the subject merchandise sold at less than normal value (“NV”). In addition, Petitioner alleges that subject imports exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(A) of the Act.

Petitioner contends that the industry’s injured condition is illustrated by reduced market share, reduced production, reduced shipments, reduced capacity and capacity utilization, underselling and price depression or suppression, reduced employment, hours worked, and wages paid, decline in financial performance, lost sales and revenue, and increase in import penetration. See Vol. I of the Petition, at 16–60. We have assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, and causation, and we have determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation. See Checklist at Attachment III, Injury.

Allegations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value

The following is a description of the allegations of sales at less than fair value upon which the Department based its decision to initiate this investigation of imports of multilayered wood flooring from the PRC. The sources of data for the deductions and adjustments relating to the U.S. price and the factors of production are also discussed in the initiation checklist. See Initiation Checklist.

U.S. Price

Petitioner calculated export price (“EP”) based on documentation of offers for sales obtained from a proprietary source. See Initiation Checklist; see also Volume II of the Petition, at 1–2 and Exhibit II–1.

Normal Value

Petitioner claims the PRC is a non-market economy (“NME”) country and that no determination to the contrary has been made by the Department. See Volume II of the Petition, at 3. The presumption of NME status for the PRC has not been revoked by the Department and, therefore, in accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, remains in effect for purposes of the initiation of this investigation. Accordingly, the NV of the product for the PRC investigation is appropriately based on factors of production valued in a surrogate market-economy country in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act. In the course of this investigation, all parties, including the public, will have the opportunity to provide relevant information related to the issue of the PRC’s NME status and the granting of separate rates to individual exporters.

Petitioner contends that Indonesia is the appropriate surrogate country for the PRC because: (1) It is at a level of economic development comparable to that of the PRC and (2) it is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. See Volume II of the Petition, at 3–6, and Exhibits II–2, II–3, and II–4. Based on the information provided by Petitioner, we believe that it is appropriate to use Indonesia as a surrogate country for initiation purposes. After initiation of the investigation, interested parties will have the opportunity to submit comments regarding surrogate country selection and, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.301(c)(3)(i), will be provided an opportunity to submit publicly available information to value factors of production within 40 days after the date
of publication of the preliminary determination.

Petitioner calculated NV and the dumping margins using the Department’s NME methodology as required by 19 CFR 351.220(b)(7)(i)(C) and 19 CFR 351.408. In calculating NV, Petitioner based the quantity of each of the inputs used to manufacture multilayered wood flooring in the PRC on product-specific consumption rates of a multilayered wood flooring producer in the United States (“Surrogate Domestic Producer”) for identical or similar merchandise during the POI. See Volume II of the Petition, at 6–8 and Exhibits II–5 and II–6. Petitioner states that the actual usage rates of the foreign manufacturers of multilayered wood flooring are not reasonably available; however, Petitioner notes that according to the information available, the production of multilayered wood flooring in the PRC relies on similar production methods to the Surrogate Domestic Producer. See Volume II of the Petition, at 6–7 and Exhibit II–12.

As noted above, Petitioner determined the consumption quantities of all raw materials based on the production experience of the Surrogate Domestic Producer. Petitioner valued most of the factors of production based on reasonably available, public surrogate country data, specifically, Indonesian import statistics from the Global Trade Atlas (“GTA”). See Volume II of the Petition, at 8–12 and Exhibits II–6 and II–7; see also Supplement to the AD Petition, at Supplemental Exhibit II–B. Petitioner excluded from these import statistics imports from countries previously determined by the Department to be NME countries. Petitioner also excluded import statistics from India, the Republic of Korea and Thailand, as the Department has previously excluded prices from these countries because they maintain broadly available, non-industry-specific export subsidies. See Volume II of the Petition, at Exhibit II–7. In addition, Petitioner made currency conversions, where necessary, based on the POI- average rupiah/U.S. dollar exchange rate, as reported on the Department’s Web site. See Volume II of the Petition, at 8 and Exhibit II–6. Petitioner determined labor costs using the labor consumption, in hours, derived from the Surrogate Domestic Producer’s experience. See Volume II of the Petition, at 8 and Exhibit II–5. For purposes of initiation, the Department determines that the surrogate values used by Petitioner are reasonably available and, thus, acceptable for purposes of initiation.

Petitioner determined energy and utility costs using the usage rates derived from the Surrogate Domestic Producer’s experience. See Volume II of the Petition, at 10 and Exhibit II–6. However, when constructing the NV of the subject merchandise, Petitioner did not individually incorporate the diesel fuel, electricity, and water inputs into the normal value calculation, because Petitioner could not segregate energy costs from the surrogate financial statements, and so accounted for the diesel fuel, electricity, and water costs in the calculation of surrogate financial ratios. Id. This is consistent with the Department’s recent decision in Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts From the People’s Republic of China: Final Affirmative Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, 74 FR 16838 (April 13, 2009), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2. See Volume II of the Petition, at 11 and Exhibit II–6; see also Supplement to the AD Petition, at Supplemental Exhibit II–B. Petitioner determined labor costs using data from Chapter 5B of the International Labour Organization’s database to calculate a simple average of industry-specific wage rates from a basket of countries that are economically comparable to the PRC and are significant exporters of the like merchandise. See Supplement to the AD Petition at 3, and Supplemental Exhibit II–C; see also Letter regarding the Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties on Imports of Multilayered Wood Flooring From the People’s Republic of China: Supplemental Questions, dated October 27, 2010.

Petitioner determined packing costs using consumption rates derived from the Surrogate Domestic Producer’s experience, valued using data from the GTA. See Volume II of the Petition, at 12 and Exhibits II–6 and II–7.

Petitioner based factory overhead, selling, general and administrative expenses, and profit on data from PT Tirta Mahakam Resources, Tbk., an Indonesian manufacturer of multilayered wood flooring, for the 2009 fiscal year. See Volume II of the Petition, at 11–12 and Exhibit II–12.

Fair-Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by Petitioner, there is reason to believe that imports of multilayered wood flooring from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Based on a comparison of U.S. prices and NV calculated in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, as described above, the estimated dumping margins for multilayered wood flooring from the PRC range from 194.49 percent to 280.60 percent. See Initiation Checklist and Supplement to the AD Petition at Exhibit II–B.

Initiation of Antidumping Investigation

Based upon the examination of the Petition on multilayered wood flooring from the PRC, the Department finds the Petition meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of multilayered wood flooring from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. In accordance with section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determination no later than 140 days after the date of this initiation.

Targeted Dumping Allegations

On December 10, 2008, the Department issued an interim final rule for the purpose of withdrawing 19 CFR 351.414(f) and (g), the regulatory provisions governing the targeted dumping analysis in antidumping duty investigations, and the corresponding regulation governing the deadline for targeted dumping allegations, 19 CFR 351.301(d)(5). See Withdrawal of the Regulatory Provisions Governing Targeted Dumping in Antidumping Duty Investigations, 73 FR 74930 (December 10, 2008). The Department stated that “withdrawal will allow the Department to exercise the discretion intended by the statute and, thereby, develop a practice that will allow interested parties to pursue all statutory avenues of relief in this area.” Id. at 74931.

In order to accomplish this objective, if any interested party wishes to make a targeted dumping allegation in this investigation pursuant to section 777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act, such allegation is due no later than 45 days before the scheduled date of the preliminary determination.

Respondent Selection

For this investigation, the Department will request quantity and value information from known exporters and producers identified with complete contact information in the Petition. The quantity and value data received from NME exporters/producers will be used as the basis to select the mandatory respondents.

The Department requires that the respondents submit a response to both the quantity and value questionnaire and the separate-rate application by the
respective deadlines in order to receive consideration for separate-rate status. See Circular Welded Austenitic Stainless Pressure Pipe from the People’s Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation, 73 FR 10221, 10225 (February 26, 2008); Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Certain Artist Canvas From the People’s Republic of China, 70 FR 21996, 21999 (April 28, 2005). On the date of the publication of this initiation notice in the Federal Register, the Department will post the quantity and value questionnaire along with the filing instructions on the Import Administration Web site at http://ia.ita.doc.gov/ia-highlights-and-news.html, and a response to the quantity and value questionnaire is due no later than December 3, 2010. Also, the Department will send the quantity and value questionnaire to those PRC companies identified in Volume I of the Petition, at Exhibit I–6.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Instructions for filing such applications may be found on the Department’s Web site at http://ia.ita.doc.gov/apo.

Separate Rates Application

In order to obtain separate-rate status in NME investigations, exporters and producers must submit a separate-rate status application. See Policy Bulletin 05.1: Separate-Rates Practice and Application of Combination Rates in Antidumping Investigations involving Non-Market Economy Countries, dated April 5, 2005 (“Policy Bulletin”), available on the Department’s Web site at http://ia.ita.doc.gov/policy/bull05–1.pdf. Based on our experience in processing the separate-rate applications in previous antidumping duty investigations, we have modified the application for this investigation to make it more administrable and easier for applicants to complete. See, e.g., Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Certain New Pneumatic Off-the-Road Tires From the People’s Republic of China, 72 FR 43591, 43594–95 (August 6, 2007). The specific requirements for submitting the separate-rate application in this investigation are outlined in detail in the application itself, which will be available on the Department’s Web site at http://ia.ita.doc.gov/ia-highlights-and-news.html on the date of publication of this initiation notice in the Federal Register. The separate-rate application will be due 60 days after publication of this initiation notice. For exporters and producers who submit a separate-rate status application and subsequently are selected as mandatory respondents, these exporters and producers will no longer be eligible for consideration for separate rate status unless they respond to all parts of the questionnaire as mandatory respondents. As noted in the “Respondent Selection” section above, the Department requires that respondents submit a response to both the quantity and value questionnaire and the separate rate application by the respective deadlines in order to receive consideration for separate-rate status.

Use of Combination Rates in an NME Investigation

The Department will calculate combination rates for certain respondents that are eligible for a separate rate in this investigation. The Policy Bulletin states:

‘‘[W]hile continuing the practice of assigning separate rates only to exporters, all separate rates that the Department will now assign in its NME investigations will be specific to those producers that supplied the exporter during the period of investigation. Note, however, that one rate is calculated for the exporter and all of the producers which supplied subject merchandise to it during the period of investigation. This practice applies both to mandatory respondents receiving an individually calculated separate rate as well as the pool of non-investigated firms receiving the weighted-average of the individually calculated rates. This practice is referred to as the application of “combination rates” because such rates apply to specific combinations of exporters and one or more producers. The cash-deposit rate assigned to an exporter will apply only to merchandise both exported by the firm in question and produced by a firm that supplied the exporter during the period of investigation.’’

See Policy Bulletin at 6 (emphasis added).

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.220(l), copies of the public versions of the Petition have been provided to the representatives of the Government of the PRC. Because of the large number of producers/exporters identified in the Petition, the Department considers the service of the public version of the Petition to the foreign producers/exporters satisfied by the delivery of the public version to the Government of the PRC, consistent with 19 CFR 351.220(3)(2).

ITC Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, no later than December 6, 2010, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of multilayered wood flooring from the PRC are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated; otherwise, this investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.


Ronald K. Lorentzen,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix I—Scope of the Investigation

Multilayered wood flooring is composed of an assembly of two or more layers or plies of wood veneer(s) in combination with a core. The several layers, along with the core, are glued or otherwise bonded together to form a finished assembled product. Multilayered wood flooring is often referred to by other terms, e.g., “engineered wood flooring” or “plywood flooring.” Regardless of the particular terminology, all products that meet the description set forth herein are intended for inclusion within the definition of subject merchandise.

Multilayered wood flooring is included within the definition of subject merchandise, without regard to: Dimension (overall thickness, thickness of face ply, thickness of back ply, thickness of core, and thickness of inner plies; width; and length); wood species used for the face, back and inner veneers; core composition; and face grade.

Multilayered wood flooring included within the definition of subject merchandise may be unfinished (i.e., without a finally finished surface to protect the face veneer from wear and tear) or “prefinished” (i.e., a coating applied to the face veneer, including, but not exclusively, oil or oil-modified or water-based polyurethanes, ultra-violet light cured polyurethanes, wax, epoxy-ester finishes, moisture-cured urethanes and acid-curing formaldehyde finishes.) The veneers may be also soaked in an acrylic-impregnated finish. All multilayered wood flooring is included within the definition of subject merchandise regardless of whether or not it is manufactured with any interlocking or connecting mechanism (for example, tongue-and-groove construction or locking joints). All multilayered wood flooring is included within the definition of subject merchandise regardless of whether the product meets a particular industry or similar standard.

* A “veneer” is a thin slice of wood, rotary cut, sliced or sawed from a log, bolt or itch. Veneer is referred to as a ply when assembled.
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration

[570–971]
Multilayered Wood Flooring From the People’s Republic of China: Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation

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

DATES: Effective Date: November 18, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yasmin Nair and Joshua Morris, AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3813 and (202) 482–1779, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petition

On October 21, 2010, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) received a petition filed in proper form by the Coalition for American Hardwood Parity (“Petitioner”), whose members (Anderson Hardwood Floors, LLC; Award Hardwood Floors; Baker’s Creek Wood Floors, Inc.; From the Forest; Howard Hardwood Flooring; Mannington Mills, Inc.; Nydree Flooring; Shaw Industries Group, Inc.) are domestic producers of multilayered wood flooring. In response to the Department’s requests, Petitioner provided timely information supplementing the Petition on October 29, 2010, November 2, 2010, and November 3, 2010. Petitioner also provided information supplementing the Petition on November 9, 2010.

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), Petitioner alleges that manufacturers, producers, or importers of multilayered wood flooring from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”) received countervailable subsidies within the meaning of section 701 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, the domestic industry producing multilayered wood flooring in the United States.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C), (E), and (F) of the Act, and Petitioner has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the countervailing duty (“CVD”) investigation (see “Determination of Industry Support for the Petition” section below).

On November 4, 2010, we received comments from Lumber Liquidators Services, LLC (“Lumber Liquidators”) and Home Legend, LLC (“Home Legend”). U.S. importers of multilayered wood flooring (collectively, “importers”). Lumber Liquidators and Home Legend are interested parties as defined by section 771(9)(A) of the Act. The importers and U.S. Floors LLC (“US Floors”) filed additional comments on November 9, 2010.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation is January 1, 2009, through December 31, 2009.

Scope of Investigation

The products covered by the investigation are multilayered wood flooring products from the PRC. For a full description of the scope of the investigation, please see “Scope of the Investigation,” in Appendix I of this notice.

Comments on Scope of Investigation

During our review of the Petition, we discussed the scope with Petitioner to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. As a result, the “Scope of Investigation” language has been modified from the language in the Petition to reflect these clarifications. Moreover, as discussed in the preamble to the Department’s regulations (Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final rule, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997)), we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all interested parties to submit such comments by November 30, 2010, twenty calendar days from the signature date of this notice. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration’s APO/Dockets Unit, Room 1970, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. The period of the scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and to consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination.

Consultations

Pursuant to section 702(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act, on October 22, 2010, the Department invited representatives of...