

fishing, boating, camping, pet and related products (duty rate ranges from duty-free to 48%).

FTZ procedures could exempt Cabela's from customs duty payments on foreign products that will be re-exported (approximately 1% of shipments). On its domestic sales, the company would be able to defer duty payments until merchandise is shipped from the plant and entered for consumption. FTZ designation would further allow Cabela's to realize logistical benefits through the use of weekly customs entry procedures. The request indicates that the savings from FTZ procedures would help improve the facility's international competitiveness.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, Elizabeth Whiteman 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 10, 2011. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to May 25, 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 Elizabeth Whiteman at Elizabeth.Whiteman@trade.gov or (202) 482-0473.

Dated: March 7, 2011.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011-5698 Filed 3-10-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-821-819]

Magnesium Metal From the Russian Federation: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results of Administrative Review Pursuant to Court Decision

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

SUMMARY: On March 1, 2011, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) sustained the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) results of redetermination as applied to PSC VSMPO-AVISMA Corporation (VSMPO-AVISMA) pursuant to the CIT's remand order in *PSC VSMPO-Avisma Corp. v. United States*, 724 F. Supp. 2d 1308 (CIT 2010) (*AVISMA II*). The Department is notifying the public that the final CIT judgment in this case is not in harmony with the Department's final determination and is amending the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on magnesium metal from the Russian Federation covering the period of review April 1, 2006, through March 31, 2007 with respect to VSMPO-AVISMA.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 11, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dmitry Vladimirov or Minoo Hatten, AD/CVD Operations, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0665 or (202) 482-1690, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 10, 2008, the Department published the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on magnesium metal from the Russian Federation for the period of review (POR) April 1, 2006, through March 31, 2007. See *Magnesium Metal from the Russian Federation: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 52642 (September 10, 2008) (*Final Results*). In the *Final Results* the Department determined that it was appropriate to treat raw magnesium and chlorine gas as co-products and employed a net-realizable-value (NRV) analysis to allocate joint costs incurred up to the split-off point where raw magnesium and chlorine gas

become separately identifiable products. The CIT remanded the *Final Results* to the Department to take into account an affidavit from Dr. George Foster, an accounting professor (the Foster Affidavit), when considering the best methodology for calculating the NRV for the chlorine gas.¹ See *PSC VSMPO-AVISMA Corp. v. United States*, 31 I.T.R.D. 2235 (CIT 2009) (*AVISMA I*). In accordance with the CIT's order in *AVISMA I*, the Department admitted the Foster Affidavit into the record, considered the arguments of Dr. Foster upon remand, and, as a result of that consideration, determined not to recalculate the dumping margin for VSMPO-AVISMA upon concluding that Dr. Foster's proposed methodology was not appropriate to use in this case. See *Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Remand*, dated March 30, 2010 (*First Remand*) (available at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/remands>). As a result, in the *First Remand* the Department adhered to the same allocation methodology it used in the *Final Results*.

In *AVISMA II*, the CIT remanded the *Final Results* again, instructing the Department to consider VSMPO-AVISMA's entire production process, including titanium production, in allocating joint costs to the subject merchandise. The CIT found the Department's cost-allocation methodology in the *Final Results* to be unsupported by substantial record evidence and not in accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). See *AVISMA II*, 724 F. Supp. 2d at 1313-16. In accordance with the CIT's order in *AVISMA II*, and under respectful protest, the Department reexamined its calculation methodology to take VSMPO-AVISMA's entire production process into account, including the stages of production encompassing and following ilmenite catalyzation, and, based on that examination, the Department recalculated the weighted-average dumping margin for VSMPO-AVISMA. See *Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Remand*, dated November 22, 2010 (*Second Remand*) (available at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/remands>). As a result of the Department's recalculations, the weighted-average dumping margin for the period April 1, 2006, through March 31, 2007, for magnesium metal from the Russian Federation is 8.51 percent for VSMPO-AVISMA. The CIT sustained

¹ VSMPO-AVISMA submitted the Foster Affidavit as part of its administrative case brief, dated June 11, 2008, which the Department rejected as untimely new factual information.

the Department's *Second Remand* on March 1, 2011. *See PSC VSMPO–Avisma Corp. v. United States*, Consol. Court No 08–00321, Slip Op. 11–22 (March 1, 2011) (*AVISMA III*); *see also Second Remand*.

Timken Notice

Consistent with the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (CAFC 1990) (*Timken*), as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (CAFC 2010), pursuant to section 516A(c) of the Act, the Department must publish a notice of a court decision that is not “in harmony” with a Department determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a “conclusive” court decision. The CIT’s judgment in *AVISMA III* on March 1, 2011, sustaining the Department’s *Second Remand* with respect to VSMPO–AVISMA constitutes a final decision of that court that is not in harmony with the Department’s *Final Results*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*. Accordingly, the Department will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise pending the expiration of the period of appeal or, if appealed, pending a final and conclusive court decision.

Amended Final Results

Because there is now a final court decision with respect to VSMPO–AVISMA, the weighted-average dumping margin for the period April 1, 2006, through March 31, 2007, for magnesium metal from the Russian Federation is 8.51 percent for VSMPO–AVISMA. The cash-deposit rate will remain the company-specific rate established for the subsequent and most recent period for which the Department reviewed VSMPO–AVISMA. *See Magnesium Metal From the Russian Federation: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 75 FR 56989 (September 17, 2010). In the event the CIT’s ruling is not appealed or, if appealed, upheld by the CAFC, the Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to assess antidumping duties on entries of the subject merchandise exported during the POR by VSMPO–AVISMA using the revised assessment rates calculated by the Department in the *Second Remand*.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 516A(e)(1), 751(a)(1), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 7, 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2011–5691 Filed 3–10–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–896]

Magnesium Metal From the People’s Republic of China: Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: As a result of the determinations by the Department of Commerce (“Department”) and the International Trade Commission (“ITC”) that revocation of the antidumping duty order on magnesium metal from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”) would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, the Department is publishing a notice of continuation of the antidumping duty order.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 11, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Stolz, 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) 482–4474.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 1, 2010, the Department initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping duty order on magnesium metal from the PRC, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”). *See Initiation of Five-Year (“Sunset”) Review*, 75 FR 9160 (March 1, 2010).

As a result of its review, the Department determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on magnesium metal from the PRC would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping and, therefore, notified the ITC of the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail should the order be revoked. *See Magnesium Metal From the People’s Republic of China and the Russian Federation: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders*, 75 FR 38983 (July 7, 2010).

On February 24, 2011, the ITC notified the Department of its

determination, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the antidumping duty order on magnesium metal from the PRC would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. *See* USITC Publication 4214 (February 2011), *Magnesium From China and Russia: Investigation Nos. 731–TA–10701–1072* (Review).

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by the order is magnesium metal, which includes primary and secondary alloy magnesium metal, regardless of chemistry, raw material source, form, shape, or size. Magnesium is a metal or alloy containing by weight primarily the element magnesium. Primary magnesium is produced by decomposing raw materials into magnesium metal. Secondary magnesium is produced by recycling magnesium-based scrap into magnesium metal. The magnesium covered by the order includes blends of primary and secondary magnesium.

The subject merchandise includes the following alloy magnesium metal products made from primary and/or secondary magnesium including, without limitation, magnesium cast into ingots, slabs, rounds, billets, and other shapes, magnesium ground, chipped, crushed, or machined into raspings, granules, turnings, chips, powder, briquettes, and other shapes: Products that contain 50 percent or greater, but less than 99.8 percent, magnesium, by weight, and that have been entered into the United States as conforming to an “ASTM Specification for Magnesium Alloy”¹ and thus are outside the scope of the existing antidumping order on magnesium from the PRC (generally referred to as “alloy” magnesium).

The scope of the order excludes the following merchandise: (1) All forms of pure magnesium, including chemical combinations of magnesium and other material(s) in which the pure magnesium content is 50 percent or greater, but less than 99.8 percent, by weight, that do not conform to an “ASTM Specification for Magnesium Alloy;”² (2) magnesium that is in liquid

¹ The meaning of this term is the same as that used by the American Society for Testing and Materials in its *Annual Book of ASTM Standards: Volume 01.02 Aluminum and Magnesium Alloys*.

² This material is already covered by existing antidumping orders. *See Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Pure Magnesium From the People’s Republic of China, the Russian Federation and Ukraine; Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Antidumping Duty Investigation of Pure Magnesium From the Russian Federation*, 60 FR 25691 (May 12, 1995), and