

position. For the two-year period for which data were analyzed, five establishments had seven, seven, nine, nine, and 10 positive results (the same five establishments with the largest number of positive results identified above). Of these, three establishments had a second full set of 56 samples, with a total number of six positive results (one, two, and three), for a rate of 3.6 percent, still above average. These three establishments though would have met the standard and thus would have been taken off the list. If the proposed grace period option were operating, then it would have been invoked if there had been six positive results instead of seven for one of the sets; in such a case, any of results from the second sets given above would have resulted in the establishment not meeting the standard, and the establishment's name would have been listed. Under FSIS' system, in this case the establishments would have been listed after the first set when there was sufficient evidence for adducing that the establishments' processes were not as good as could be relative to the rest of the industry, and then removed after the second set success, when the latest evidence would not be sufficient for such an adduction.

In conclusion, FSIS believes that its system prevents type 1 errors from occurring often and is timelier regarding when poor performing establishments would be listed. FSIS believes that its policy is appropriate for maintaining the status quo, and inducing poorer performing establishments to improve their processes to a level consistent with the industry's overall performance. By relaxing the required degree of confidence to 99 percent from 80 percent confidence, FSIS believes that it has provided a reasonable policy with regard to small deviations from the standard for which the establishment could and should address without being listed. For the compliance guideline for the turkey performance standard, the actual degree of confidence is 99.7 percent. As a consequence, FSIS does not believe a "grace period" is necessary; that if an establishment fails to meet the standard compliance criterion it would indicate that the establishment's process can be improved. In addition, (1) The discrepancy between the baseline and HACCP percentages of positive results can be "explained" for the most part by the disproportional distribution of samples over time and over establishments; (2) HACCP verification data show that over 90 percent of the sets in the time period analyzed had no more than three positive results, and thus for the most part it seems that establishments have been performing recently at or better than the specified performance standard.

[FR Doc. 2011-6585 Filed 3-18-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Sanders County Resource Advisory Committee Meeting

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of Sanders County Resource Advisory Committee Meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the authorities in the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463) and under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106-393) the Lolo and Kootenai National Forests' Sanders County Resource Advisory Committee will meet on April 21, 2011 at 7 p.m. in Thompson Falls, Montana for a business meeting. The meeting is open to the public.

**DATES:** April 21, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Thompson Falls Courthouse, 1111 Main Street, Thompson Falls, MT 59873.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Randy Hojem, Designated Federal Official (DFO), District Ranger, Plains Ranger District, Lolo National Forest at (406) 826-3821.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Agenda topics include solicitation for new RAC project proposals, reviewing progress on current projects, and receiving public comment. If the meeting location is changed, notice will be posted in the local newspapers, including the Clark Fork Valley Press, and Sanders County Ledger.

Dated: March 14, 2011.

**Randy R. Hojem,**  
District Ranger.

[FR Doc. 2011-6503 Filed 3-18-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-P

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

[0209IDP30910]

#### Upper Rio Grande Resource Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Upper Rio Grande Resource Advisory Committee will meet in Monte Vista, Colorado. The committee is meeting as authorized under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (Pub. L. 110-343) and in compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The purpose is to review and recommend project proposals to be funded with Title II money.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held on April 11, 2011 and will begin at 10 a.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the South Fork Community Building, 0254 Highway 149, South Fork,

Colorado. Written comments should be sent to Mike Blakeman, San Luis Valley Public Lands Center, 1803 West U.S. Highway 160, Monte Vista, CO 81144. Comments may also be sent via e-mail to [mblakeman@fs.fed.us](mailto:mblakeman@fs.fed.us), or via facsimile to 719-852-6250.

All comments, including names and addresses when provided, are placed in the record and are available for public inspection and copying. The public may inspect comments received at the San Luis Valley Public Lands Center, 1803 West U.S. Highway 160, Monte Vista, CO 81144.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mike Blakeman, RAC coordinator, USDA, San Luis Valley Public Lands Center, 1803 West U.S. Highway 160, Monte Vista, CO 81144; 719-852-6212; E-mail [mblakeman@fs.fed.us](mailto:mblakeman@fs.fed.us).

Individuals who use telecommunication devices for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, Monday through Friday.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The meeting is open to the public. The following business will be conducted: (1) Introductions of all committee members, replacement members and Forest Service personnel; (2) Review status of approved projects; (3) Review, evaluate and recommend project proposals to be funded with Title II money; (4) Create a timeline to receive and review new project proposals and schedule the next meeting; and (5) 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: March 15, 2011.

**Dan S. Dallas,**

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 2011-6531 Filed 3-18-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 20-2011]

#### Foreign-Trade Zone 106—Oklahoma City, OK Application for Reorganization/Expansion Under Alternative Site Framework

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) by the Port Authority of Greater Oklahoma City, grantee of FTZ 106, requesting authority to reorganize and expand the zone under the alternative site framework (ASF)

adopted by the Board (74 FR 1170, 1/12/09 (correction 74 FR 3987, 1/22/09); 75 FR 71069–71070, 11/22/10). The ASF is an option for grantees for the establishment or reorganization of general-purpose zones and can permit significantly greater flexibility in the designation of new “usage-driven” FTZ sites for operators/users located within a grantee’s “service area” in the context of the Board’s standard 2,000-acre activation limit for a general-purpose zone project. The application was submitted pursuant to the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR part 400). It was formally filed on March 15, 2011.

FTZ 106 was established by the Board on September 13, 1984 (Board Order 271, 49 FR 36133, 9/21/84), and expanded on December 7, 1989 (Board Order 455, 54 FR 51441, 12/15/89), on February 10, 2000 (Board Order 1078, 65 FR 8337–8338, 2/18/00), on September 28, 2007 (Board Order 1529, 72 FR 56722–56723, 10/4/07), and on June 26, 2009 (Board Order 1628, 74 FR 32892, 7/9/09).

The current zone project consists of six sites (totaling 1,450 acres) in the Oklahoma City area: *Site 1* (1,061 acres)—within the 6,700-acre Will Rogers World Airport complex; *Site 2* (6 acres)—Biagi Bros. Warehouse, 5002 SW 36th, Oklahoma City; *Site 8* (30 acres)—Will Rogers World Airport NE, immediately northeast of Will Rogers World Airport, Oklahoma City; *Site 12* (26 acres, sunset 10/31/2012)—ICON Center Industrial Park, 300 Arlington, Ada; *Site 13* (308 acres)—within the 401-acre Guthrie/Edmond Regional Airport, 520 Airport Road, Guthrie; and, *Site 14* (19 acres, expires 6/30/2014)—Industrial Gasket, Inc. dba International Group, facility, 720 South Sara Road, Mustang. (Note: Sites 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 have expired or were deleted through a previous Board action.)

The grantee’s proposed service area under the ASF would be Blaine, Caddo, Canadian, Cleveland, Comanche, Custer, Garfield, Garvin, Grady, Kay, Kingfisher, Lincoln, Logan, McClain, Noble, Oklahoma, Payne, Pontotoc, Pottawatomie, Seminole and Stephens Counties, Oklahoma. If approved, the grantee would be able to serve sites throughout the service area based on companies’ needs for FTZ designation. The proposed service area is within and adjacent to the Oklahoma City Customs and Border Protection port of entry.

The applicant is requesting authority to reorganize its existing zone project to include existing Sites 12, 13 and 14 as “magnet sites”, existing Site 2 as a “usage-driven” site, and combine

existing Site 1 and Site 8 to become Site 1 (new site total—1,091 acres) as a magnet site. The ASF allows for the possible exemption of one magnet site from the sunset time limits that generally apply to sites under the ASF, and the applicant proposes that Site 1 be so exempted. The applicant is also requesting approval of two additional “magnet” sites: *Proposed Site 15* (67.688 acres)—Enid Woodring Regional Airport/Cimarron Industrial Park, 1026 S. 66th, Enid (Garfield County); and, *Proposed Site 16* (63.434 acres)—Shawnee Regional Airport, 2202 Airport Road, Shawnee (Pottawatomie County). Because the ASF only pertains to establishing or reorganizing a general-purpose zone, the application would have no impact on FTZ 106’s authorized subzones.

In accordance with the Board’s regulations, Camille Evans of the FTZ Staff is designated examiner to evaluate and analyze the facts and information presented in the application and case record and to report findings and recommendations to the Board.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board’s Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is May 20, 2011. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to June 6, 2011.

A copy of the application will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 2111, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the “Reading Room” section of the Board’s Web site, which is accessible via <http://www.trade.gov/ftz>. For further information, contact Camille Evans at [Camille.Evans@trade.gov](mailto:Camille.Evans@trade.gov) or (202) 482–2350.

Dated: March 15, 2011.

**Andrew McGilvray,**

*Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2011–6562 Filed 3–18–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–580–816]

#### Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From the Republic of Korea: Notice of Final Results of the Sixteenth Administrative Review

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

**SUMMARY:** On September 14, 2010, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the antidumping duty administrative review for certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products (CORE) from the Republic of Korea (Korea). See *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From the Republic of Korea: Notice of Preliminary Results of the Sixteenth Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 75 FR 55769 (September 14, 2010) (*Preliminary Results*). This review covers eight manufacturers and/or exporters (collectively, the respondents) of the subject merchandise: LG Chem., Ltd. (LG Chem); Haewon MSC Co. Ltd. (Haewon); Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd. (Dongbu); Hyundai HYSCO (HYSCO); Pohang Iron & Steel Co., Ltd. (POSCO) and Pohang Coated Steel Co., Ltd. (POCOS) (collectively, POSCO); Dongkuk Industries Co., Ltd. (Dongkuk); LG Hausys, Ltd. (Hausys); and Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Union).<sup>1</sup> The period of review (POR) is August 1, 2008, through July 31, 2009.

As a result of our analysis of the comments received, these final results differ from the *Preliminary Results*. For our final results, we find that Union and Dongbu made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV), and that POSCO and HYSCO have not. In addition, based on the final results for the respondents selected for individual review, we have determined a weighted-average margin for those companies that were not selected for individual review.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* March 21, 2011.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Dennis McClure (Union), Jolanta Lawska (HYSCO), Christopher Hargett

<sup>1</sup> As noted in the *Preliminary Results*, the Department selected HYSCO, POSCO, Dongbu and Union as mandatory respondents in this review. See Memorandum from Dennis McClure, International Trade Compliance Analyst, through James Terpstra, Program Manager, to Melissa Skinner, Director, Office 3, entitled “2008–2009 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Republic of Korea: Selection of Respondents for Individual Review,” dated December 7, 2009.