Miscellaneous Tariff Bill

Final Disclosure Form

Part I: Type of Disclosure

This form is being submitted for H.R. 4897 as a disclosure submitted reflecting information provided through MTB public comment period and the International Trade Commission's Congressional Bill Report.

Part II: Written Statement

Member Name: Russ Carnahan

A. □ Is the tariff relief specified in this Miscellaneous Tariff Bill available to any entity that imports and pays duties pursuant to this tariff heading? If not, why?

Yes.

Please list any known entities currently importing under the tariff heading specified in the Miscellaneous Tariff Bill, including those listed in the Preliminary Disclosure Form, ITC Congressional Bill Report, and any public comments: (if additional space is required, please attach with this form)

Brown Shoe Co.

(public comments attached)

B. □ Does the tariff relief specified in this Miscellaneous Tariff Bill benefit downstream producers, manufacturers, purchasers, and consumers?

Yes

Part III: Financial Benefit Certification

I hereby certify that neither myself nor my spouse has a financial interest in any entity named in Part II.A above.

(Member Signature)

11/27/12

Date

June 18, 2012

Jamie Hunter
Government Relations Director
202.775.5752 DIRECT
202.857.6395 FAX
hunter.jamie@arentfox.com

The Honorable Dave Camp
Chairman
House Committee on Ways and Means
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Sander Levin
Ranking Member
House Committee on Ways and Means
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Camp and Ranking Member Levin:

On behalf of the Rubber and Plastic Footwear Manufacturers Association, which represents the domestic footwear manufacturing industry, I object to the following miscellaneous tariff bill:

H.R. 4897 – Rep. Carnahan (6402.91.80)

This bill conflicts with a product produced domestically by New Balance shoes.

Sincerely,
James A. Hunter
Government Relations Director
Arent Fox, LLP

TARGET

June 22, 2012

United States Congress
United States House or Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means

Dear Sir or Madam:

Target Corporation supports bill HR 4897 and is not aware of any US production of the goods described in this bill. Target believes that this bill will benefit US consumers. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Lisa Schulte

Lisa Schulte
Senior Manager,
Global Trade Strategy & Compliance
Target Corporation
763-405-0302
lisa.schulte@target.com

FDRA
FOOTWEAR DISTRIBUTORS AND RETAILERS OF AMERICA

June 21, 2012

The Honorable Dave Camp
Chairman
House Committee on Ways & Means

The Honorable Sander M. Levin
Ranking Member
House Committee on Ways & Means

Re: Comments Regarding Footwear Miscellaneous Tariff Bills

Dear Chairman Camp and Ranking Member Levin:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments regarding the miscellaneous tariff bills (MTBs) under your consideration.

The Footwear Distributors and Retailers of America (FDRA) and its members strongly support the miscellaneous tariff bill process in order to provide duty relief and strengthen American businesses and consumers. FDRA is the nation's largest footwear trade association accounting for approximately 75% of all footwear sales in the United States. FDRA represents the industry's leading retailers, brands and buying agents. Our U.S. footwear retailers include Foot Locker, JC Penney, Payless ShoeSource, Famous Footwear and Zappos, as well as major brand names and distributors such as Nike, PUMA, K-Swiss, Steve Madden, and Wolverine Worldwide.

As you may know, 99 percent of all footwear sold in the United States is imported. Footwear imports are subject to some of the highest tariff rates on consumer goods, with some as high as 67.5%. Duty reductions on footwear provide meaningful benefits both to the importer and U.S. consumers who must bear the bulk of the duty cost. In short, providing duty relief on non-sensitive footwear as proposed in the MTB process would support good paying U.S. jobs in design, logistics and retail, while allowing our members to provide better value to our customers.

Therefore, I present this letter in support of the following MTBs covering footwear products:

H.R. 4502	H.R. 5165
H.R. 4503	H.R. 5166
H.R. 4504	H.R. 5175
H.R. 4505	H.R. 5176
H.R. 4891	H.R. 5177

Matt Priest, President
1319 F Street, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20004 • (p) 202.737.5660 • (f) 202.638.2615 • mpriest@fdra.org • www.fdra.org

H.R. 4892
H.R. 4893
H.R. 4894
H.R. 4895
H.R. 4896
H.R. 4897
H.R. 4898
H.R. 4899
H.R. 4900
H.R. 4901
H.R. 4926
H.R. 4927
H.R. 4928
H.R. 4929
H.R. 4993
H.R. 4994
H.R. 4995
H.R. 5029
H.R. 5030
H.R. 5164
H.R. 5330
H.R. 5423
H.R. 5424
H.R. 5425
H.R. 5426
H.R. 5427
H.R. 5428
H.R. 5429
H.R. 5430
H.R. 5431
H.R. 5432
H.R. 5559
H.R. 5560
H.R. 5561
H.R. 5562
H.R. 5564
H.R. 5616
H.R. 5617
H.R. 5618
H.R. 5619

FDRA commends your leadership and support of the miscellaneous bill process and it is our hope that the MTB will continue to be an effective tool to relieve the unnecessary burden of tariffs on non-controversial imports.

Thank you for again for your leadership on behalf of our entire industry and the broader American trade community. Our members look forward to an expedient passage of this important legislation.

Best Regards,

R. Matthew Priest
President

TRADEWINS

November 2012

Hon. Dave Camp, Chairman
Hon. Sander Levin, Ranking Member
House Committee on Ways and Means
1104 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Re: MTB Comments

Dear Chairman Camp and Ranking Member Levin:

On behalf of E.S. Originals Inc., we are providing, for inclusion in the Committee's public comment repository, the attached document urging rejection of certain footwear-related Miscellaneous Tariff Bills (MTBs). Please contact the undersigned with any questions on this submission.

Sincerely,

John R. Magnus

Attachment

TRADE**WINS** LLC
2740 34th Place, NW
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 744-0368
www.tradewinsllc.net

November 2012

Three "New" Footwear Duty Suspensions Should Be Excluded from Any MTB Package Processed During the Lame Duck Session

A package of duty suspensions is being considered during the final, post-election stretch of the 112th Congress. Three of the new footwear MTB proposals – H.R. 4897 (Carnahan), H.R. 4898 (Carnahan), and H.R. 5564 (Blumenauer) – should be rejected as they do not meet the criteria for inclusion in an MTB package.

H.R. 4897

- **Products affected**: Footwear with outer soles and uppers of rubber or plastics, covering the ankle, valued over $6.50 but not over $12/pair, other than tennis shoes, basketball shoes, gym shoes, training shoes, or the like, for women, other than work footwear (provided for in subheading 6402.91.80).

- **Reasons for rejecting**:
  - *Controversial* – opposed by domestic producers (RPFMA, New Balance)
  - *Giveaway of trading stock* that is important in TPP negotiation; also an undeserved giveaway to China
  - *Gerrymandered* – introduces new discrimination against like products that get no duty cut, thereby creating an apparent WTO-inconsistency

H.R. 4898

- **Products affected**: Same as H.R. 4897 but valued between $12-$20/pair (provided for in subheading 6402.91.90).

- **Reasons for rejecting**:
  - *Controversial* – opposed by domestic producers (RPFMA, New Balance)
  - *Exceeds maximum revenue impact* – scored over $1.1M in each year by ITC
  - *Giveaway of trading stock* that is important in TPP negotiation; also an undeserved giveaway to China
  - *Gerrymandered* – introduces new discrimination against like products that get no duty cut, thereby creating an apparent WTO-inconsistency

H.R. 5564

- **Products affected**: Footwear with outer soles and uppers of rubber or plastics, other than house slippers, and other than such footwear for men or women, the foregoing with open toes or open heels, or of the slip-on type, that is held to the foot without the use of laces or buckles or other fasteners, except footwear of subheading 6402.99.33 and except footwear having a foxing or a foxing-like band wholly or almost wholly of rubber or plastics applied or molded at the sole and overlapping the upper (provided for in subheading 6402.99.49).

- **Reasons for rejecting**:
  - *Exceeds maximum revenue impact* – scored over $3.7M in each year by ITC
  - *Giveaway of trading stock* that is important in TPP negotiation; also an undeserved giveaway to China
  - *Gerrymandered* – introduces new discrimination against like products that get no duty cut, thereby creating an apparent WTO-inconsistency