Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item number 3920.62.00.90. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

**Intent To Rescind the 2010 Countervailing Duty Administrative Review**

SRF submitted a letter to the Department on September 12, 2011, certifying that it had no shipments of subject merchandise that entered the United States during calendar year 2010, which is the period of review (POR). Petitioners did not comment on SRF’s claim of no shipments or entries.

Previously, on September 1, 2011, the Department released the results of a U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data query to interested parties with an administrative protective order for this segment of the administrative review, which showed SRF had no suspended entries of subject merchandise during the POR. After the receipt of SRF’s no shipment certification, we sent a “no shipments inquiry” message to CBP, which posted the message on October 12, 2011.² We have not received any responses from CBP regarding the no shipments inquiry indicating that there were any suspended entries from SRF during the POR. See Memorandum to the File through Barbara E. Tillman, Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, “Claim of No Shipments from SRF Limited in the 2010 Administrative Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip from India” (dated concurrently with this notice).

Based on our analysis of all of the information on the record, we preliminarily determine that SRF had no shipments or entries of subject merchandise during the POR. Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), and consistent with our practice,³ we preliminarily determine to rescind the review for SRF. Because SRF is the sole remaining company in this administrative review, the rescission of the review with respect to SRF would result in a rescission of the administrative review in its entirety.

**Public Comment**

The Department is setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding the Department’s preliminary intent to rescind the administrative review for SRF. Interested parties should submit such comments within 20 calendar days of the publication of this notice. Comments must be filed electronically via Import Administration’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (IA ACCESS) (https://iaaccess.trade.gov/). The period for public comment is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all views prior to making a final determination concerning whether to rescind the administrative review.

We are issuing this notice in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).


Christian Marsh,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2012–3972 Filed 2–17–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

**Notice of Scope Rulings**

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

**DATES:** Effective Date: February 21, 2012.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (‘‘Department’’) hereby publishes a list of scope rulings completed between April 1, 2011, and June 30, 2011. In conjunction with this list, the Department is also publishing a list of requests for scope rulings and anticircumvention determinations pending as of June 30, 2011. We intend to publish future lists after the close of the next calendar quarter.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Julia Hancock, AD/CVD Operations, China/NME Group, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: 202–482–1394.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

The Department’s regulations provide that the Secretary will publish in the Federal Register a list of scope rulings on a quarterly basis. See 19 CFR 351.225(e). Our most recent notification of scope rulings was published on November 29, 2011. See Notice of Scope Rulings, 76 FR 73596 (November 29, 2011). This current notice covers all scope rulings and anticircumvention determinations completed by Import Administration between April 1, 2011, and June 30, 2011, inclusive, and it also lists any scope or anticircumvention inquiries pending as of June 30, 2011. As described below, subsequent lists will follow after the close of each calendar quarter.

**Scope Rulings Completed Between April 1, 2011, and June 30, 2011**

People’s Republic of China


Requestor: R&D Chemicals, Inc.; “Bite Lite” brand candles are not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; April 18, 2011.


Requestor: New Trend Engineering Limited; its wheel hub units are within the scope of the antidumping duty order; April 18, 2011.


Requestor: Bosda International (USA) LLC and Kingdom Auto Parts Ltd.; its wheel hub units are within the scope of the antidumping duty order; June 14, 2011.


Requestor: Lucky Distributing, Inc.; its cast smart splitter is not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; June 6, 2011.


Requestor: Lifetime Products, Inc.; its 33-inch round tables are not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; May 2, 2011.


Requestor: Meco Corporation; its pedestal tables are not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; May 19, 2011.


Requestor: Acme Furniture Industry Inc.; partially upholstered daybed with trundle unit is within the scope of the antidumping duty order; fully upholstered daybed without trundle unit is not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; April 15, 2011.


Requestor: Ashley Furniture Industries Inc.; certain polyurethane mirrors and an upholstered mirror are
not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; April 26, 2011.
Requestor: Gang Yan Diamond Products, Inc.; certain rescue/demolition blades are not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; June 27, 2011.
Requestor: OTR Wheel Engineering, Inc.; its Trac Master and Traction Master tires are within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders; April 26, 2011.
Requestor: The Super Poly Partnership; the laminated woven sacks produced by The Super Poly Partnership from imported woven fabric are not within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders; May 18, 2011.
Requestor: Smith-Western Co.; certain decorative refrigerator magnets are not within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders; April 15, 2011.
Requestor: Wickline Bedding Enterprises; Wickline’s premium and standard unfinished mattresses are not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; May 31, 2011.
A–570–932: Certain Steel Threaded Rod from the People’s Republic of China.
Requestor: Powerline Hardware, LLC; the spool bolts and shank pins it imports are not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; May 13, 2011.
A–570–932: Certain Steel Threaded Rod from the People’s Republic of China.
Requestor: A.L. Patterson; its engineered steel coil rod is within the scope of the antidumping duty order; May 24, 2011.
Requestor: Global Commodity Group LLC (“GCC”); the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”)–origin portion of GCC’s “blended” citric acid is within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders, and is dutiable according to the amount of citric acid from the PRC that it contains; May 2, 2011.
Requestor: Olson Wire Products Co., Ltd.; its certain supermarket shelving units and commercial oven racks that fit within size parameters of the scope of the antidumping duty order are subject to the antidumping duty order; its certain supermarket shelving units and commercial oven racks that do not fit within the size parameters of the scope (i.e. shelving and racks with dimensions ranging from 3 inches by 5 inches by 0.10 inch to 28 inches by 34 inches by 6 inches; baskets with dimensions ranging from 2 inches by 4 inches by 3 inches to 28 inches by 34 inches by 16 inches; side racks from 6 inches by 6 inches by 0.5 inches to 16 inches by 30 inches by 4 inches; or subframes from 6 inches by 10 inches by 0.1 inch to 28 inches by 34 inches by 6 inches) are not within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders; June 8, 2011.
Requestor: Eurow & O’Reilly Corporation; knitted fleece automotive electric blanket is not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; April 14, 2011.
Japan
A–588–804: Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from Japan.
Requestor: Aisin Holdings of America; worm assemblies and seat track rollers are not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; May 12, 2011.
A–588–804: Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from Japan.
Requestor: American NTN Bearing Manufacturing Corporation; magnetic encoders used in antilock braking systems in automobiles are not within the scope of the antidumping duty order; June 1, 2011.
Multiple Countries
Requestor: Jingzhou Meihou Flexible Magnet Co. Ltd; its rolls of meter-wide magnet sheeting, craft magnets, and door gasket extrusions are within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders; May 10, 2011.
Anticircumvention Determinations
Completed Between April 1, 2011, and June 30, 2011
None.
Scope Inquiries Pending as of June 30, 2011
People’s Republic of China
Requestor: Trade Associates Group, Ltd.; whether its candles (multiple designs) are within the scope of the antidumping duty order; requested June 11, 2009.
Requestor: Sourcing International, LLC; whether its flower candles are within the scope of the antidumping duty order; requested June 24, 2009.
Requestor: Sourcing International; whether its candles (multiple designs) are within the scope of the antidumping duty order; requested July 28, 2009.
Requestor: Sourcing International; whether its floral bouquet candles are within the scope of the antidumping duty order; requested August 25, 2009.
Requestor: Candym Enterprises Ltd.; whether its vegetable candles are within the scope of the antidumping duty order; requested November 9, 2009.
Requestor: DF Machinery International, Inc.; whether certain agricultural hub units are within the scope of the antidumping duty order; requested May 12, 2011.
Requestor: General Mills, Inc.; whether minced garlic is within the scope of the antidumping duty order; requested April 13, 2011.
Requestor: ESM; whether U.S.-origin pure magnesium exported to the PRC for atomization and re-exported to the U.S. is within the scope of the order; requested February 11, 2011; initiated May 2, 2011.
Requestor: US Magnesium LLC; whether pure magnesium feedstock exported from the PRC to Mexico and then processed into granular magnesium before exportation to the U.S. is within the scope of the order; requested April 28, 2011; initiated June 1, 2011.
Requestor: WelCom Products; whether its MC2 Magna Cart, MCI Magna Cart and MCK Magna Cart are within the scope of the antidumping duty order; requested October 12, 2010; initiated October 27, 2010; preliminary ruling May 9, 2011.


Requestor: Paper Resources, LLC.; whether certain lightweight thermal paper (“LWTP”) converted into smaller LWTP rolls in the PRC, from jumbo LWTP rolls produced in certain third countries, is within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders; requested February 24, 2011; initiated April 4, 2011.


Requestor: HoMedics Inc.; whether its knitted electric heating blanket is within the scope of the antidumping duty order; requested June 22, 2011.


Requestor: A.O. Smith Corporation; whether water heater anodes are within the scope of the antidumping duty order; requested June 14, 2011.


Requestor: American Fence Manufacturing Company LLC; whether fence sections, posts and gates are within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders; requested June 15, 2011.


Requestor: Endura Products; whether door thresholds containing aluminum extrusions imported from the PRC are within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders; requested: June 2, 2011.


Requestor: Origin Point Brands; whether imported aluminum fencing systems are within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders; requested June 27, 2011.

Mexico

A–201–830: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Mexico.

Requestor: Nucor Corporation and Cascade Steel Rolling Mills, Inc.; whether wire rod with an actual diameter between 4.75 and 5.00 millimeters is within the scope of the antidumping order; requested 2/14/2011; initiated May 31, 2011.

Italy

A–475–822: Stainless Steel Plate in Coils from Italy.

Requestor: AAVID Thermalloy LLC (“AAVID”); whether 24 steel clips imported by AAVID are within the scope of the antidumping duty order; requested June 1, 2011.

Multiple Countries


Requestor: Fedmet Resources Corporation; whether its magnesia alumina carbon bricks are within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders; accepted June 28, 2011.


Requestor: Nation Ford Chemical Co., and Sun Chemical Corp.; whether finished carbazole violet pigment exported from Japan is within the scope of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders; requested February 23, 2010; preliminary ruling May 6, 2011.


Anticircumvention Rulings Pending as of June 30, 2011


Requestor: Geo Specialty Chemicals, Inc. and Chattem Chemicals, Inc.; whether glycine from the PRC, when processed and re-packaged in India and exported as Indian-origin glycine, is circumventing the antidumping duty order; requested December 18, 2009; initiated October 22, 2010.


Requestor: ArcelorMittal USA, Inc.; Nucor Corporation; SSAB N.A.D., Evraz Claymont Steel and Evraz Oregon Steel Mills; whether certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from the PRC that contains a small level of boron is circumventing the antidumping duty order; requested February 17, 2010; preliminary determination published February 22, 2011.


Requestor: Seaman Paper Company of Massachusetts, Inc.; whether certain imports of tissue paper from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam are circumventing the antidumping duty order through means of third country assembly or completion; requested February 18, 2010; initiated March 29, 2010; preliminary determination published April 6, 2011.


Requestor: Coating Excellence International, LLC and Polytex Fibers Corporation; whether laminated woven sacks that are printed with two ink colors, but have the appearance of three or more colors in register, are circumventing the antidumping and countervailing duty orders; requested January 26, 2011; initiated April 22, 2011.


Requestor: M&B Metal Products Inc.; whether certain imports of steel wire garment hangers from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam are circumventing the antidumping duty order through means of third country assembly or completion of merchandise imported from the PRC; requested May 5, 2010; initiated July 22, 2010; preliminary determination published May 10, 2011.


Requestor: SGL Carbon LLC and Superior Graphite Co.; whether unfinished small diameter graphite electrodes produced in the PRC and completed and assembled in the United Kingdom are circumventing the antidumping duty order; requested November 30, 2010; initiated February 17, 2011.

Russia

A–821–807: Ferrovanadium and Nitrided Vanadium from Russia.

Requestor: AMG Vanadium, Inc.; whether vanadium pentoxide imports from Russia that are converted into ferrovanadium in the United States are circumventing the antidumping duty order; requested February 25, 2011; initiated May 2, 2011.

Interested parties are invited to comment on the completeness of this list of pending scope and anticircumvention inquiries. Any comments should be submitted to the Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD...
Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Questionnaire To Support Review of Federal Assistance Applications

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before April 23, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Information Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at JJessup@doc.gov).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Cristi Reid, (301) 713–1622 x206 or Cristi.Reid@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for extension of a currently approved information collection. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 through 4327) and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) implementing regulations (40 CFR parts 1500 through 1508) require that an environmental analysis be completed for all major Federal actions significantly affecting the environment. NEPA applies only to the actions of Federal agencies. While those Federal actions may include a Federal agency’s decision to fund non-Federal projects under grants and cooperative agreements, NEPA requires agencies to assess the environmental impacts of actions proposed to be taken by these recipients only when the Federal agency has sufficient discretion or control over the recipient’s activities to deem those actions as Federal actions. To determine whether the activities of the recipient of a Federal financial assistance award (i.e., grant or cooperative agreement) involve sufficient Federal discretion or control, and to undertake the appropriate environmental analysis when NEPA is required, NOAA must assess information which can only be provided by the Federal financial assistance applicant. Thus, NOAA has developed an environmental information questionnaire to provide grantees and Federal grant managers with a simple tool to ensure that project and environmental information is obtained. The questionnaire applies only to those programs where actions are considered major Federal actions or to those where NOAA must determine if the action is a major Federal action. The questionnaire includes a list of questions that encompasses a broad range of subject areas. The applicants are not required to answer every question in the questionnaire. Each program draws from the comprehensive list of questions to create a relevant subset of questions for applicants to answer. The information provided in answers to the questionnaire is used by NOAA staff to determine compliance requirements for NEPA and conduct subsequent NEPA analysis as needed. The information provided in the questionnaire may also be used for other regulatory review requirements associated with the proposed project, such as issuance of permits.

II. Method of Collection

Methods of submittal include paper forms via the mail, Internet, and facsimile transmission.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648–0538. Form Number: None. Type of Review: Regular submission (extension of a currently approved collection).

Affected Public: Business or other for profit organizations; individuals or households; not-for-profit institutions; state, local, or tribal government; and Federal government.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,000.

Estimated Time per Response: 3 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 3,000.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $1,000 in reporting/recordkeeping costs.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use ofautomated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.


Gwellnar Banks,
Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Application and Reports for Scientific Research and Enhancement Permits Under the Endangered Species Act

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before April 23, 2012.