Title II Projects submitted by the public. (4) Public comment. Persons who wish
to bring related matters to the attention
of the Committee may file written
statements with the Committee staff
before or after the meeting.

Dated: January 10, 2011.

Randal D. Charles,
Acting Designated Federal Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Humboldt Resource Advisory Committee (RAC)

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Humboldt Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) will meet in
Eureka, California. The committee meeting is authorized under the Secure
Rural Schools and Community Self-
Determination Act (Pub. L. 110–343)
and in compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

DATES: The meeting will be held
February 1, 2011, from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Six Rivers National Forest Office,
1330 Bayshore Way, Eureka, CA 95501.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Adam Dellinger, Committee
Coordinator, at (707) 441–3569; e-mail
adellinger@fs.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting is open to the public. The
agenda includes a public comment period and a review of all Title II project
proposals received to date.

Dated: January 10, 2011.

Tyrone Kelley,
Forest Supervisor.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[FR Doc. 2011–874 Filed 1–14–11; 8:45 am]

Folding Metal Tables and Chairs From
the People’s Republic of China: Final
Results of 2007–2008 Deferred
Antidumping Duty Administrative
Review and Final Results of 2008–2009
Antidumping Duty Administrative
Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (“Department”) published its
preliminary results of the 2007–2008 deferred and 2006–2009 administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order
on folding metal tables and chairs
(“FMTCs”) from the People’s Republic of
China (“PRC”) on July 14, 2010.¹ The
periods of review (“POR”) are June 1, 2007, through May 31, 2008, for the
defered administrative review, and
June 1, 2008, through May 31, 2009, for
the administrative review. We invited
interested parties to comment on our
preliminary results. Based on our
analysis of the comments received, we
have made changes to our margin
calculations. Therefore, the final results
differ from the preliminary results. The
final dumping margins for these reviews are listed in the “Final Results of
Review” section below.

DATES: Effective Date: January 18, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lilit Astvatsatryan or Erin Kearney, AD/CVD
Operations, Office 8, Import
Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of
Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230;
telephone: (202) 482–6412 or (202) 482–
0167, respectively.

Background

On July 14, 2010, the Department
published its preliminary results. See
Preliminary Results. On August 3, 2010,
Meco Corporation (“Meco”), the
petitioner in the underlying
investigation, provided new surrogate
value information for the 2008–2009
review based on Indonesia, including
financial statements from PT Lion Metal
Works Tbkb (“Lion”).² New-Tec
Integration (Xiamen) Co., Ltd. (“New-

¹ See Folding Metal Tables and Chairs from the
People’s Republic of China: Preliminary Results of
Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 75 FR
40788 (July 14, 2010) (“Preliminary Results”).
² We note that in the preliminary results, we have
selected India as the surrogate country in both
folding tables and folding chairs made primarily or exclusively from steel or other metal (folding metal chairs). Folding metal chairs include chairs with one or more cross-braces, regardless of shape or size, affixed to the front and/or rear legs with rivets, welds or any other type of fastener. Folding metal chairs include:

Those that are made solely of steel or other metal; those that have a back pad, a seat pad, or both a back pad and a seat pad; and those that have seats or backs made of plastic or other materials. The subject merchandise is commonly, but not exclusively, packed singly, in multiple packs of the same item, or in five piece sets consisting of four chairs and one table. Specifically excluded from the scope of the order regarding folding metal chairs are the following:

Folding metal chairs with a wooden back or seat, or both;

Lawn furniture;

Stools;

Chairs with arms; and

Child-sized chairs.

The subject merchandise is currently classifiable under subheadings 9401.79.0045, 9401.79.0050, 9403.20.0018, 9403.20.0015, 9403.20.0010, 9403.60.8040, 9403.70.8010, 9403.70.8020, and 9403.70.8030 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the Department’s written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

Based on a request by RPA International Pty., Ltd. and RPS, LLC (collectively, “RPA”), the Department ruled on January 13, 2003, that RPA’s poly-fold metal folding chairs are within the scope of the order because they are identical in all material respects to the merchandise described in the petition, the initial investigation, and the determinations of the Secretary.

On May 5, 2003, in response to a request by Staples, the Office Superstore Inc. (“Staples”), the Department issued a scope ruling that the chair component of Staples’ “Complete Office-To-Go,” a folding chair with a tubular steel frame and a seat and back of plastic, with measurements of: height: 32.5 inches; width: 18.5 inches; and depth: 21.5 inches, is covered by the scope of the order because it is identical in all material respects to the scope description in the order, but that the table component, with measurements of: Width (table top): 43 inches; depth (table top): 27.375 inches; and height: 34.875 inches, has legs that fold as a unit and meets the requirements for an exemption from the scope of the order.

On September 7, 2004, the Department found that table styles 4600 and 4606 produced by Lifetime Plastic Products Ltd. are within the scope of the order because these products have all of the components that constitute a folding metal table as described in the scope.

On July 13, 2005, the Department issued a scope ruling determining that “butterfly” chairs are not within the scope of the antidumping duty order because they do not meet the physical description of merchandise covered by the scope of the order as they do not have cross braces affixed to the front and/or rear legs, and the seat and back is one piece of cloth that is not affixed to the frame with screws, rivets, welds, or any other type of fastener.

On July 13, 2005, the Department issued a scope ruling determining that folding metal chairs imported by Korhani of America Inc. are within the scope of the antidumping duty order because the imported chair has a wooden seat, which is padded with foam and covered with fabric or polyvinyl chloride, attached to the tubular steel seat frame with screws, and has cross-braces affixed to its legs.

On May 1, 2006, the Department issued a scope ruling determining that “moon chairs” are not included within the scope of the antidumping duty order because moon chairs have different physical characteristics, different uses, and are advertised differently than chairs covered by the scope of the order.

On October 4, 2007, the Department issued a scope ruling determining that International E–Z Up Inc.’s (“E–Z Up”) Instant Work Bench is not included within the scope of the antidumping duty order because its legs and weight do not match the description of the folding metal tables in the scope of the order.

On April 18, 2008, the Department issued a scope ruling determining that the VIKA Twofold 2-in-1 Workbench/
Scaffold (“Twofold Workbench/ Scaffold”) imported by Ignite USA, LLC from the PRC is not included within the scope of the antidumping duty order because its rotating leg mechanism differs from the folding metal tables subject to the order, and its weight is twice as much as the expected maximum weight for folding metal tables within the scope of the order.

On May 6, 2009, the Department issued a final determination of circumvention, determining that imports from the PRC of folding metal tables with legs connected by cross-bars, so that the legs fold in sets, and otherwise meeting the description of in-scope merchandise, are circumventing the order and are properly considered to be within the class or kind of merchandise subject to the order on FMTCs from the PRC.

On May 22, 2009, the Department issued a scope ruling determining that folding metal chairs that have legs that are not connected with cross-bars are within the scope of the antidumping duty order on folding metal tables and chairs from the PRC.

On October 27, 2009, the Department issued a scope ruling that Lifetime Products, Inc.’s (“Lifetime”) fold-in-half adjustable height tables are not included within the scope of the antidumping duty order because Lifetime’s tables essentially share the physical characteristics of banquet tables, which are expressly excluded from the scope of the order and, therefore, are outside the scope of the order.

On July 27, 2010, the Department issued a scope ruling determining that the bistro set imported by Academy Sports & Outdoors, consisting of two chairs and a table, are outside the scope of the antidumping duty order because they constitute lawn furniture, which is expressly excluded from the scope of the order.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the post-preliminary comments by parties in these reviews are addressed in the memorandum from Gary Taverman, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the 2007–2008 Deferred Administrative Review and the 2008–2009 Administrative Review of Folding Metal Tables and Chairs from the PRC” (January 10, 2010) (“Issues and Decision Memorandum”), which are hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues that parties raised and to which we responded in the Issues and Decision Memorandum is attached to this notice as an appendix. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file in the Central Records Unit (“CRU”) in room 7046 in the main Department building, and is also accessible on the Web at http://www.trade.gov/ia. The paper copy and electronic version of the memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of comments received, we have made changes in the margin calculations for Feili in both the 2007–2008 deferred and 2008–2009 reviews, and for New-Tec in the 2008–2009 review. We have revised the calculation of normal value to reflect a change in the wage rate from $1.23 to $1.22 for both reviews.5

Final Results of Review

We determine that the following dumping margins exist for the POR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturer/exporter</th>
<th>Margin (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feili (6/1/2008–5/31/2009)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Tec (6/1/2008–5/31/2009)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This rate is de minimis.

Assessment

The Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise in accordance with the final results of these reviews. For assessment purposes, we calculated exporter/importer- (or customer) specific assessment rates for merchandise subject to these reviews. Where appropriate, we calculated an ad valorem rate for each importer (or customer) by dividing the total dumping margins for reviewed sales to that party by the total entered values associated with those transactions. For duty-assessment rates calculated on this basis, we will direct CBP to assess the resulting ad valorem rate against the entered customs values for the subject merchandise. Where appropriate, we calculated a per-unit rate for each importer (or customer) by dividing the total dumping margins for reviewed sales to that party by the total sales quantity associated with those transactions. For duty-assessment rates calculated on this basis, we will direct CBP to assess the resulting per-unit rate against the entered quantity of the subject merchandise. Where an importer- (or customer) specific assessment rate is de minimis under 19 CFR 351.106(c) (i.e., less than 0.50 percent), the Department will instruct CBP to assess that importer (or customer’s) entries of subject merchandise without regard to antidumping duties. The Department intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after publication of the final results of these reviews.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of the 2008–2009 administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For Feili and New-Tec, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established in the final results of review (except, if the rate is zero or de minimis, no cash deposit will be required); (2) for previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters not listed above that have separate rates, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the exporter-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise that have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC-wide rate of 70.71 percent; and (4) for all non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise that have not received their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC exporters that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice 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 the review period. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.402(f)(3), failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Department’s presumption that...
reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (“APO”) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO as explained in the administrative protective order itself. 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 the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

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

Dated: January 10, 2011.

Paul Piquado,
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix

List of Comments and Issues in the Issues and Decision Memorandum

Comment 1: Selection of the Primary Surrogate Country
A. Economic Comparability
B. Significant Production of Comparable Merchandise
C. Best Available Surrogate Value Information

Comment 2: Surrogate Financial Statements
A. General Comments
B. Receipt of Subsidies
C. Contemporaneity of Financial Statements
D. Selection of Financial Statements Based on Sales and Production
E. Selection of Financial Statements Based on Primary Business Activity

Comment 3: Surrogate Financial Statements Contained on the Record

Comment 4: Whether it is Appropriate To Change the Primary Surrogate Country Between Issuance of the Preliminary and Final Results

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Jerry Huang or Steven Hampton, 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) 482–4047 and (202) 482–0116 respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 14, 2010, the Department published the Preliminary Results of the second administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain polyester staple fiber (“PSF”) from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”). See Certain Polyester Staple Fiber From the People’s Republic of China: Notice of Preliminary Results and Preliminary Rescission, in Part, of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 75 FR 40777 (July 14, 2010) (“Preliminary Results”). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the Preliminary Results. Based upon our analysis of the comments and information received, we made changes to the margin calculations for the final results. We continue to find that sales have not been made below normal value (“NV”) with respect to the mandatory respondents who participated fully and are entitled to a separate rate in this administrative review.

DATES: Effective Date: January 18, 2011.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–905]

Certain Polyester Staple Fiber From the People’s Republic of China: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Second Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration.

International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On July 14, 2010, the Department of Commerce ("Department") published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of the second administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain polyester staple fiber (“PSF”) from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”). See Certain Polyester Staple Fiber From the People’s Republic of China: Notice of Preliminary Results and Preliminary Rescission, in Part, of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 75 FR 40777 (July 14, 2010) (“Preliminary Results”). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the Preliminary Results. Based upon our analysis of the comments and information received, we made changes to the margin calculations for the final results. We continue to find that sales have not been made below normal value (“NV”) with respect to the mandatory respondents who participated fully and are entitled to a separate rate in this administrative review.

On October 26, 2010, the Department issued a memorandum regarding the Department’s proposed industry-specific wage rate methodology for the final results and invited interested parties to comment. On November 5, 2010, Ningbo DaFa and Cixi Santai filed comments on the Department’s wage rate methodology. On November 10, 2010, DAK Americas LLC (“Petitioner”) filed rebuttal comments.

The Department did not hold a public hearing pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(d), as any hearing request made by interested parties was withdrawn.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to these reviews are addressed in the “Certain Polyester Staple Fiber from the People’s Republic of China: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of 2008/2009 Administrative Review,” which is dated concurrently with and adopted by this notice (“Decision Memo”). A list of the issues which parties raised and to which we respond in the Decision Memo is attached to this notice as an Appendix. The Decision Memo is a public document and is on file in the Central Records Unit, main Commerce building, Room 7046, and is accessible on the Department’s Web site at http://www.trade.gov/ia. The paper copy and electronic version of the memorandum are identical in content.

Period of Review

The period of review (“POR”) is June 1, 2008, through May 31, 2009.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by the order is synthetic staple fibers, not carded, combed or otherwise processed for spinning, of polyesters measuring 3.3 decitex (3 denier, inclusive) or more in diameter. This merchandise is cut to lengths varying from one inch (25 mm) to five inches (127 mm). The subject merchandise may be coated, usually with a silicon or other finish, or not coated. PSF is generally used as stuffing in sleeping bags, mattresses, ski jackets,