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 or (202) 482–2350.

Dated: June 24, 2011.

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.
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DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board
[Order No. 1772]

Reorganization of Foreign-Trade Zone 102, Under Alternative Site Framework; St. Louis, MO

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, the Board adopted the alternative site framework (ASF) in December 2008 (74 FR 1170–1173, 01/12/2009; correction 74 FR 3987, 01/22/2009; 75 FR 71069–71070, 11/22/2010) as an option for the establishment or reorganization of general-purpose zones;

Whereas, the St. Louis County Port Authority, grantee of FTZ 102, submitted an application to the Board (FTZ Docket 61–2010, filed 10/19/2010) for authority to reorganize under the ASF with a service area that includes the City of St. Louis and St. Louis County, Missouri, within and adjacent to the St. Louis Customs and Border Protection port of entry; FTZ 102’s existing Sites 3A, 3B and 3C would be renumbered as Sites 3, 4 and 5, respectively; Sites 2, 3, 4 and 5 would be categorized as magnet sites; and, Site 1 would be categorized as a usage-driven site;

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the Federal Register (75 FR 65612–65613, 10/26/2010) and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner’s report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board’s regulations are satisfied, and that the proposal is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The application to reorganize and expand FTZ 102 under the alternative site framework is approved, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations, including Section 400.28, to the Board’s standard 2,000-acre activation limit for the overall general-purpose zone project, to a five-year ASF sunset provision for magnet sites that would terminate authority for Sites 3, 4 and 5 if not activated by June 30, 2016, and to a three-year ASF sunset provision for usage-driven sites that would terminate authority for Site 1 if no foreign-status merchandise is admitted for a bona fide customs purpose by June 30, 2014.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 22nd day of June 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

ATTEST:

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.
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SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Case History

On August 13, 2010, the Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers Coalition (“DSMC”) filed a submission to the Department requesting that it conduct a CCR of the antidumping duty order on diamond sawblades and parts thereof from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”) to determine whether Hebei Husqvarna is the successor-in-interest to Electrolux Construction Products (Xiamen) Co. Ltd. (“Electrolux”), Husqvarna Holding AB, or is an altogether new entity that would therefore be subject the PRC-wide rate. On August 20, 2010, the DSMC submitted further information supporting its claim that Hebei Husqvarna should be found to be the successor-in-interest to Electrolux, Husqvarna Holding AB, or found to be a new entity. On September 13, 2010, Respondent 1 submitted to the Department a request for a CCR, contending that Hebei Husqvarna should be considered the successor-in-interest to Hebei Jikai. On September 30, 2010, the Department initiated a CCR based on these two requests but did not expedite the review, as requested by Respondent, because the Department required additional information to perform the successor-in-interest analysis.2

Between October 13, 2010, and April 12, 2011, Hebei Husqvarna and the DSMC submitted questionnaire responses and comments regarding the successor-in-interest factors that the Department considers in making a determination. In its April 12, 2011, submission, the DSMC argued that the Department should apply adverse facts available (“AFA”) to Hebei Husqvarna and terminate the review because Hebei Husqvarna failed to provide complete information for two of the four criteria (described below) that the Department typically examines in a successor-in-interest analysis.

Scope of the Order

The products covered by the order are all finished circular sawblades, whether slotted or not, with a working part that

1 The second request for initiation of a changed circumstances review was submitted on behalf of Husqvarna Construction Products North America, Inc., Hebei Jikai, and Hebei Husqvarna, collectively (“Respondent”). However, because the Department requested and received information from individual companies that compose Respondent, in certain instances the Department will refer to specific companies.