of the Secretary. Members shall be appointed by the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs in consultation with the agencies. Committee members shall be professionals in appropriate disciplines, including economists, statisticians, survey methodologists, computer scientists, data scientists, and behavioral scientists who are experts in their fields, recognized for their scientific, professional, and operational achievements and objectivity. Membership will represent data users with expertise from the public sector, academia, and the private sector.

Members will be chosen to achieve a balanced membership that will meet the needs of the agencies. Members shall serve as Special Government Employees (SGEs) and shall be subject to ethics rules applicable to SGEs.

A FESAC member term is three years. Members may serve more than one term as described in the FESAC Charter, available at: https://apps.bea.gov/fesac/.

Compensation for Members

Members of the Committee serve without compensation but may receive reimbursement for Committee-related travel and lodging expenses.

Solicitation of Nominations

The Committee is currently filling one or more positions on the FESAC. The Under Secretary of Economic Affairs, in consultation with the agencies, will consider nominations of all qualified individuals to ensure that the Committee includes the areas of experience noted above. Individuals may nominate themselves or other individuals, and professional associations and organizations may nominate one or more qualified persons for membership on the Committee. Nominations shall state that the nominee is willing to serve as a member and carry out the duties of the Committee. A nomination package should include the following information for each nominee:

1. A letter of nomination stating the name, affiliation, and contact information for the nominee, the basis for the nomination (i.e., what specific attributes recommend the nominee for service in this capacity), and the nominee’s field(s) of experience
2. A biographical sketch of the nominee
3. A copy of the nominee’s curriculum vitae; and
4. The name, return address, email address, and daytime telephone number at which the nominator can be contacted.

The Committee aims to have a balanced representation among its members, considering such factors as geography, age, sex, race, ethnicity, technical expertise, community involvement, and knowledge of programs and/or activities related to FESAC. Individuals will be selected based on their expertise in or representation of specific areas as needed by FESAC.

All nomination information should be provided in a single, complete package. Interested applicants should send their nomination package to Gianna Marrone, Committee Management Official, at Gianna.Marrone@bea.gov (subject line “FESAC Nomination”).


Sabrina L. Montes,

[FR Doc. 2021–26213 Filed 12–1–21; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[86 FR 49478]
Foreign-Trade Zone (FTZ) 75—Phoenix, Arizona; Authorization of Production Activity; VIAVI Solutions, Inc. (Optically Variable Pigments); Chandler, Arizona

On July 29, 2021, VIAVI Solutions, Inc. submitted a notification of proposed production activity to the FTZ Board for its facility within FTZ 75, in Chandler, Arizona.

The notification was processed in accordance with the regulations of the FTZ Board (15 CFR part 400), including notice in the Federal Register inviting public comment (86 FR 44345, August 9, 2021). On November 26, 2021, the applicant was notified of the FTZ Board’s decision that no further review of the activity is warranted at this time. The production activity described in the notification was authorized, subject to the FTZ Act and the FTZ Board’s regulations, including Section 400.14.

Dated: November 26, 2021.

Elizabeth Whiteman,
Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2021–26151 Filed 12–1–21; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration

[86 FR 49479]
Certain Softwood Lumber Products From Canada: Final Results of the Countervailing Duty Administrative Review, 2019

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) determines that producers and exporters of certain softwood lumber products (softwood lumber) from Canada received countervailable subsidies during the period of review, January 1, 2019, through December 31, 2019.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan Hall-Eastman (Canfor), John Hoffner (DII), Kristen Johnson/Samuel Brummitt (Resolute), and Laura Griffith (West Fraser), AD/CVD Operations, Office III, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401
Scope of the Order
The product covered by the Order is certain softwood lumber products from Canada. For a complete description of the scope of the Order, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum.

Analysis of Subsidy Programs and Comments Received
Commerce conducted this CVD administrative review in accordance with section 751(a)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). The subsidy programs under review, and the issues raised in case and rebuttal briefs submitted by the interested parties, are discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum. A list of the issues that the parties raised, and to which we responded in the Issues and Decision Memorandum, is attached to this notice at Appendix I. Based on our analysis of the comments received from the interested parties, we made changes to the subsidy rates calculated for certain respondents. For a discussion of these changes, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum.

Rate for Non-Selected Companies Under Review
Because the rates calculated for the companies selected for individual review are above de minimis and not based entirely on facts available, we applied a subsidy rate based on a weighted average of the subsidy rates calculated for the reviewed companies using sales data submitted by those companies to calculate a rate for the companies not selected for review. This is consistent with the methodology that we would use in an investigation to establish the all-others rate, pursuant to section 705(c)(5)(A) of the Act. A list of all non-selected companies is included in Appendix II. For further information on the calculation of the non-selected rate, see “Final Ad Valorem Rate for Non-Selected Companies under Review” in the Issues and Decision Memorandum.

Final Results of Administrative Review
In accordance with section 751(a)(1)(A) and of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5), we determine that the following total estimated countervailable subsidy rates exist for 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companies</th>
<th>Subsidy rate 2019 ad valorem (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor Corporation and its cross-owned affiliates</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D. Irving, Limited and its cross-owned affiliates</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolute FP Canada Inc. and its cross-owned affiliates</td>
<td>18.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Fraser Mills Ltd. and its cross-owned affiliates</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Selected Companies</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclosure
Commerce intends to disclose the calculations performed for these final results of review within five days of the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.244(b).

Assessment Rates
Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.212(b)(2), Commerce will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, countervailing duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise covered by this review.

Cash Deposit Requirements
In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act, Commerce intends to instruct CBP to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties in the amounts shown for the companies subject to this review. For all non-reviewed companies, we will instruct CBP to continue to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties at the most recent company-specific or all-others rate applicable to the company, as appropriate. These cash deposits, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Administrative Protective Order (APO)
This notice also serves as a final reminder to parties subject to APO of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return or 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.

Notification to Interested Parties
Commerce is issuing and publishing these final results of administrative review in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4) and 351.221(b)(5).


Ryan Majerus,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations, performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix I
List of Topics Discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum
I. Summary
II. List of Issues
III. Case History
IV. Period of Review
V. Scope of the Order
VI. Subsidies Valuation
VII. Analysis of Programs
VIII. Final Ad Valorem Rate for Non-Selected...
Companies Under Review
IX. Analysis of Comments
Comment 1: Whether Commerce Should Have Used a Sampling Methodology to Select Respondents for This Review
Comment 2: Whether Commerce Properly Required Respondents to Report “Other Assistance”
Comment 3: Whether Electricity Is a Good or a Service
Comment 4: Whether Electricity Curtailment Programs Are
Comment 5: Whether Ontario and Quebec Agreements with Consumers to Reduce GHG Are Grants
Comment 6: Whether Commerce Should Include Fontaine and Mobilier Rustique in the Final Customs Instructions
Comment 7: Whether Various Grant Programs Are Government Purchases of Services
Comment 8: Whether Stumpage Is an United Subsidy
Comment 9: Whether to Compare Government Transaction-Specific Prices to an Average Benchmark Price
Comment 10: Whether Commerce Should Calculate Benefits in the Stumpage for LTAR Program
Comment 11: Whether the Alberta Stumpage Market Is Distorted
Comment 12: Whether There Is a Useable Tier-One Benchmark in British Columbia
Comment 13: Whether There Is a Useable Tier-One Benchmark in British Columbia
Comment 14: Whether the Private Stumpage Market in New Brunswick Is Distorted and Should Be Used as a Tier-One Benchmark
Comment 15: Whether Ontario’s Crown Stumpage Market Is Distorted
Comment 16: Whether Ontario’s Stumpage Prices Distort the Log Market
Comment 17: Whether the Ontario Standing Timber Market Is Distorted and Whether the MNP Ontario Survey Prices May Serve as an Appropriate Tier One Benchmark
Comment 18: Whether Commerce Should Revise Resolute’s Stumpage Benefit Calculation Regarding Corrected Transactions
Comment 19: Whether Quebec’s Stumpage Market Is Distorted
Comment 20: Whether Quebec’s Auction Prices are an Appropriate Tier-One Benchmark to Measure Whether the GOO sold Crown-Origin Standing Timber for LTAR
Comment 21: Whether Commerce Should Use F2M Pricing Data for a U.S. PNW Log Benchmark
Comment 22: Whether Commerce Should Continue to Use a Beetle-Killed Benchmark Price for the Final Results
Comment 23: Whether Commerce’s Selection of a Log Volume Conversion Factor Was Appropriate
Comment 24: Whether Commerce Should Adjust for Tenure Security in British Columbia
Comment 25: Whether Commerce Should Adjust the BC Log Benchmark Price for Scaling and G&A Costs
Comment 26: Whether to Account for BC’s “Stand-as-a-whole” Stumpage Pricing
Comment 27: Whether the 2017–2018 Private Stumpage Survey Is Sufficiently Contemporaneous for Use as a Tier-One Benchmark
Comment 28: Whether Nova Scotia Is Comparable to Quebec, Ontario, and Alberta in Terms of Sailing Costs and Whether to Otherwise Adjust the Nova Scotia Benchmark to Account for Such Differences
Comment 29: Whether to Revise the Conversion Factor Used in Calculation of the Nova Scotia Benchmark
Comment 30: Whether Commerce Should Adjust the Method Used to Index the Nova Scotia Benchmark
Comment 31: Whether to Adjust the Nova Scotia Benchmark to Account for Fire-Killed Timber Harvested in Alberta
Comment 32: Whether to Adjust the Nova Scotia Benchmark to Account for Beetle-Killed-Timber Harvested in Alberta
Comment 33: Whether to Adjust the Nova Scotia Benchmark to Account for Beetle Killed-Timber Harvested in Quebec
Comment 34: Whether Commerce Should Adjust the Nova Scotia Benchmark to Account for Log Product Characteristics
Comment 35: Whether SPF Tree Species in Nova Scotia Are Comparable to SPF Tree Species in Quebec, Ontario, and Alberta
Comment 36: Whether to Adjust the Nova Scotia Benchmark to Account for Species Differences
Comment 37: Whether Log Pricing Differences Between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Require an Adjustment to the Nova Scotia Benchmark Utilized in JDIL’s Stumpage Benchmark Analysis
Comment 38: Whether Commerce Should Adjust the Nova Scotia Benchmark for Regional Price Disparities Within Nova Scotia
Comment 39: Whether Private Standing Timber Prices in Nova Scotia Are Available in the Provinces at Issue
Comment 40: Whether the MNP Ontario Survey Prices For Tree Size in Nova Scotia, as Measured by Diameter, Is Comparable to Tree Size in Quebec, Ontario, and Alberta
Comment 41: Whether Nova Scotia’s Forest Is Comparable to the Forests of New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, and Alberta
Comment 42: Whether Pulpmill Consumption of Standing Timber in Nova Scotia Creates Unique Market Conditions that Are Not Comparable to Market Conditions in Quebec, Ontario, and Alberta
Comment 43: Whether There Is a Fragmented and Shrinking Market for Private Timber in Nova Scotia That Has Caused Standing Timber Prices to Increase
Comment 44: Reliability of Nova Scotia Private-Origin Standing Timber Benchmark
Comment 45: Whether Commerce Should Publicly Disclose the Anonymized Data that Comprised the 2017–2018 Private Market Survey and the Price Index Used to Calculate the Nova Scotia Benchmark
Comment 46: Whether Commerce Should Make Adjustments to Stumpage Rates Paid by the Respondents to Account for “Total Remuneration” in Alberta, New Brunswick, Ontario, and Quebec
Comment 74: Whether the IESO IEI Is Countervailable.
Comment 75: Whether the IESO Demand Response Is Countervailable.
Comment 76: Whether the PCIP Is Countervailable.
Comment 77: Whether the Paix des Braves Wood Residue Program Is Countervailable.
Comment 78: Whether the Côte-Nord Wood Residue Program Is Countervailable.
Comment 79: Whether Québec’s Investment Program in Public Forests Affected by Natural or Anthropogenic Disturbances Is Countervailable.
Comment 80: Whether Québec’s MCRP Is Countervailable.
Comment 81: Whether Road Clearing Contracts with Hydro-Québec Are Countervailable.
Comment 82: Whether the PAMVFP Is Countervailable.
Comment 83: Whether the Formabois/FPDCMO Is Countervailable.
Comment 84: Whether the MFOR Is De Facto Specific.
Comment 85: Whether the MFOR Is a Non-Recurring Subsidy.
Comment 86: Whether the PJB Is Countervailable.
Comment 87: Whether the SOPFEU/SOPFIM Is Countervailable.
Comment 88: Whether Hydro-Québec’s IRR Program Is Countervailable.
Comment 89: Whether Hydro-Québec’s ISEE Program Is Countervailable.
Comment 90: Whether Hydro-Québec’s EDL Is Countervailable.
Comment 91: Whether Hydro-Québec’s Special L Rate Is Tied to Pulp and Paper.
Comment 92: Whether Hydro-Québec’s Special L Rate Confers a Benefit.
Comment 93: Whether Hydro-Québec’s IEO Is Countervailable.
Comment 94: Whether the Federal and Provincial SRED Tax Credits Are Specific.
Comment 95: Whether Class 43.2 Assets Are Tied to Non-Subject Merchandise.
Comment 96: Whether the Class 43.2 Assets Program Is De Facto Specific.
Comment 97: Whether the ACCA for Class 29 and Class 53 Assets Program Is Specific.
Comment 98: Whether Commerce Was Correct to Treat the Both the ACCA and Class 1 Additional ACCA as Individual Programs.
Comment 99: Whether the Class 1 Additional ACCA Program Provides a Financial Contribution that Confers a Benefit.
Comment 100: Whether the Class 1 Additional ACCA Program Is Specific.
Comment 101: Whether the FLTC and PLTC Are Countervailable.
Comment 102: Whether Alberta’s TEFU and British Columbia’s Coloured Fuel Program Are Countervailable.
Comment 103: Whether the Benefit Calculation for Tax Savings Under Alberta’s TEFU Is Correct.
Comment 104: Whether the EOA Property Tax Is Countervailable.
Comment 105: Whether Tax Savings Under Alberta’s Schedule D Are Countervailable.

Appendix II

Non-Selected Exporters/Producers
1. 1074712 BC Ltd.
2. 2565285 B.C. Ltd., dba Pacific Coast Cedar Products
3. 5214875 Manitoba Ltd.
4. 752615 B.C. Ltd., Fraserview Remanufacturing Inc., dba Fraserview Cedar Products
5. 9224-5737 Quebec Inc. (aka A.G. Bois)
6. A.B. Cedar Shingle Inc.
7. Absolute Lumber Products, Ltd.
8. AJ Forest Products Ltd.
9. Alberta Spruce Industries Ltd.
10. Aler Forest Products, Ltd.
11. Alpa Lumber Mills Inc.
12. AM Lumber Brokerage
13. American Pacific Wood Products
15. Andersen Pacific Forest Products Ltd.
16. Anglo-American Cedar Products, Ltd.
17. Antrim Cedar Corporation
18. Aquila Cedar Products, Ltd.
19. Arbec Lumber Inc.
20. Aspen Planers Ltd.
22. B.B. Pallets Inc.
23. Bahine Forest Products Limited
24. Bakerview Forest Products Inc.
25. Bardobe Inc.
27. Barrette-Chapais Ltee
28. Benoit & Dionne Products Foresters Ltd.
29. Best Quality Cedar Products Ltd.
30. Blanchet Multi Concept Inc.
31. Blanchette & Blanchette Inc.
32. Bois Aise de Montreal Inc.
33. Bois Bonsai Inc.
34. Bois Daquam Inc.
35. Bois D’oeuvre Cedrico Inc. (aka Cedrico Lumber Inc.)
36. Bois et Solutions Marketing SPEC, Inc.
37. Boisaco Inc.
38. Boscus Canada Inc.
39. BPWood Ltd.
40. Bramwood Forest Inc.
41. Brink Forest Products Ltd.
42. Brunswick Valley Lumber Inc.
43. Busque & Laflamme Inc.
44. C&C Wood Products Ltd.
45. Caledonia Forest Products Inc.
46. Campbell River Shake & Shingle Co., Ltd.
47. Canadian American Forest Products Ltd.
48. Canadian Wood Products Inc.
49. Casasia Forest Industries Ltd
50. Canusa cedar inc.
51. Canyon Lumber Company, Ltd.
52. Careau Bois Inc.
53. Carrier & Begin Inc.
54. Carrier Forest Products Ltd.
55. Carrier Lumber Ltd.
56. Cedar Valley Holdings Ltd.
57. Cedarline Industries, Ltd.
58. Central Alberta Pallet Supply
59. Central Cedar Ltd.
60. Central Forest Products Inc.
61. Centurion Lumber, Ltd.
62. Chaleur Sawmills LP
63. Channel-ex Trading Corporation
64. Clair Industrial Development Corp. Ltd.
65. Clermond Hamel Ltee
66. CNEF Products Inc.
67. Coast Clear Wood Ltd.
68. Coast Mountain Cedar Products Ltd.
69. Columbia River Shake & Shingle Ltd./Teal Cedar Products Ltd., dba The Teal Jones Group
70. Commonwealth Plywood Co. Ltd.
72. Conifex Fibre Marketing Inc.
73. Cowichan Lumber Ltd.
74. CS Manufacturing Inc., dba Cedarshed
75. CWP—Industriel Inc.
76. CWP—Montreal Inc.
77. D & D Pallets, Ltd.
78. Dakeryn Industries Ltd.
79. Decker Lake Forest Products Ltd.
80. Delco Forest Products Ltd.
81. Delta Cedar Specialties Ltd.
82. Devon Lumber Co. Ltd.
83. DH Manufacturing Inc.
Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2019

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration

[1A–122–857]

CERTAIN SOFTWOOD LUMBER PRODUCTS FROM CANADA:

ATTACHMENT 1

COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage of U.S. Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) determines that producers and/or exporters subject to this administrative review made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value during the period of review (POR) January 1, 2019, through December 31, 2019.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Pedersen (Canfor) or Maisha Cryor (West Fraser), AD/CVD Operations, Office IV, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration,