

respondent with standing to participate in subsequent administrative review or judicial review.

Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Comments received, including the names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposal and will be available for public inspection.

Authority: 40 CFR 1501.7 and 1508.22; Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, Section 21.

Dated: September 20, 2010.

Jeffrey DeFreest,
District Ranger.

[FR Doc. 2010-24179 Filed 9-24-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Modoc County Resource Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Modoc County Resource Advisory Committee will meet in Alturas, CA. The committee is meeting as authorized under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (Pub. L. 110-343) and in compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The purpose of the meeting is to review Resource Advisory Committee Project Applications.

DATES: The meeting will be held October 4, 2010, 4 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at Modoc National Forest Office, Conference Room, 800 West 12th St., Alturas.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kimberly H. Anderson, Forest Supervisor and Designated Federal Officer, at (530) 233-8700; or Resource Advisory Coordinator, Stephen Riley at (530) 233-8771.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The business meeting on October 4, 2010 will begin at 4 p.m., at the Modoc National Forest Office, Conference Room, 800 West 12th St., Alturas, California 96101. Agenda topics will include recruiting new project proposals that meet the intent of Public Law 110-343. Time will also be set aside for public comments at the beginning of the meeting.

Dated: September 20, 2010.

Kimberly H. Anderson,
Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 2010-24177 Filed 9-24-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-890]

Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review

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

DATES: Effective Date: September 27, 2010.

SUMMARY: On September 17, 2010, the United States Court of International Trade ("Court" or "CIT") sustained the U.S. Department of Commerce's ("Department") final results of redetermination pursuant to the Court's remand.¹ 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 (Fed. Cir. 1990) ("*Timken*"), the Department is notifying the public that the final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the Department's final results of the administrative review ("AR") of the antidumping duty order on wooden bedroom furniture ("WBF") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") covering the period of review ("POR") of January 1, 2007, through December 31, 2007.²

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Frances Veith, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street, and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4295.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 17, 2009, the Department published its *Final Results*. In response to Bon Ten's arguments in its administrative case

¹ See *Dongguan Bon Ten Furniture Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 09-00396: *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant To Remand*, dated August 9, 2010 ("*Bon Ten v. United States*").

² See *Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Reviews*, 74 FR 41374 (August 17, 2009) ("*Final Results*"), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum, as amended by *Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People's Republic of China: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Reviews*, 74 FR 55810 (October 29, 2009) ("*Amended Final Results*").

brief, the Department determined not to rescind the AR with respect to Bon Ten because Bon Ten had not demonstrated that it had no shipments during the 2007 AR POR outside of the single shipment reviewed during a new shipper review ("NSR")³ that overlapped, in part, with the 2007 AR POR.⁴ Additionally, because Bon Ten had not demonstrated its eligibility for a separate rate in the 2007 AR, the Department maintained its determination to treat Bon Ten as part of the PRC-wide entity.⁵

On August 14, 2009, Bon Ten submitted comments alleging that the Department made a ministerial error with respect to the *Final Results*. Bon Ten's ministerial error allegation focused on the Department's finding in the *Final Results* that Bon Ten had not provided any assertion prior to the submission of its case brief that it had no shipments during the 2007 AR POR outside of the shipment reviewed in the context of the NSR. Bon Ten argued that the Department did not consider its February 5, 2009, submission concerning its shipments during the 2007 AR POR in that finding.

In the *Amended Final Results*, the Department determined that, although it had inadvertently overlooked Bon Ten's February 5, 2009, submission for purposes of the *Final Results*, Bon Ten's allegation did not reflect a ministerial error. The Department reasoned that Bon Ten's allegation required reconsideration of a methodological issue, namely whether the review should be rescinded with respect to Bon Ten based upon its February 5, 2009, submission. Accordingly, the Department continued to treat Bon Ten as part of the PRC-wide entity for the AR in the *Amended Final Results*. However, the Department clarified that Bon Ten lost the separate rate status it was granted during the NSR starting on August 1, 2007, which is the first day of the administrative review that did not overlap with Bon Ten's NSR POR (*i.e.*, January 1, 2007, through July 31, 2007).⁶

On October 16, 2009, Bon Ten filed a complaint with the Court challenging the Department's determination not to rescind the AR with respect to Bon Ten

³ See *Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Fourth New Shipper Reviews*, 73 FR 64916 (October 31, 2008) ("*NSR Final Results*").

⁴ See *Final Results* at Comment 29.

⁵ See *id.*

⁶ See *Amended Final Results* and the Department's memorandum entitled, "Ministerial Error Memorandum for the Final Results of the 2007 Administrative and New Shipper Reviews of Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China," dated October 7, 2009, at Issue 4.

and its determination that it could not address its failure to consider the February 5, 2009, submission as a ministerial error. On June 7, 2010, the Department filed an unopposed motion for voluntary remand with the Court so that the Department could fully consider and evaluate the overlooked record evidence, prepare draft remand results, issue a draft to the parties for comment, analyze those comments, and take such action as may be appropriate pertaining to Bon Ten. On June 8, 2010, the Court granted the Department's voluntary remand motion.

On June 11, 2010, we issued a supplemental questionnaire to Bon Ten, in which we provided Bon Ten the opportunity to submit a no-shipment certification. On June 15, 2010, Bon Ten submitted a certification that it had no shipments of WBF during the period August 1, 2007, through December 31, 2007, the portion of the 2007 AR POR that was not covered by the preceding NSR POR. On July 16, 2010, we released to all interested parties for comment: (1) Our draft redetermination pursuant to the remand finding that Bon Ten had properly submitted its no-shipment certification and stating our intent to rescind the AR with respect to Bon Ten; (2) a U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") data listing of all type 3 entries (*i.e.*, entries subject to antidumping and countervailing duty tariffs) classified under subheadings 7009.92.5000, 9403.50.9080, and 9403.50.9040 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States that entered the United States during the 2007 AR POR and were exported/manufactured by Bon Ten; and (3) a draft version of Bon Ten's amended final cash deposit instructions reflecting the draft redetermination results, which the Department intends to send to CBP, pending the expiration of the period of appeal or, if appealed, pending a final and conclusive court decision.⁷ We received no comments from interested parties on the Department's draft redetermination results, CBP data, or the draft version of the cash deposit instructions for Bon Ten.

On August 9, 2010, the Department issued its final results of redetermination pursuant to *Bon Ten v. United States*. The remand redetermination explained that, in accordance with the CIT's instructions, we have reconsidered the record

information with regard to Bon Ten's no-shipment certification and separate-rate status for the 2007 AR. Based on this reconsideration, we have determined to rescind the 2007 AR with respect to Bon Ten pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(j) and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*, the CAFC held that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("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.⁸ The CIT's decision in *Bon Ten v. United States*, issued on September 17, 2010, constitutes a final decision of that Court that is not in harmony with the Department's *Final Results* and *Amended Final Results*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*. Accordingly, pending the expiration of the period of appeal or, if appealed, pending a final and conclusive court decision, the Department will instruct CBP to collect a cash-deposit rate for Bon Ten, effective October 31, 2008, based on the rate established in the final results of Bon Ten's NSR (*i.e.*, 0.00 percent) until completion of any subsequent administrative review of Bon Ten.⁹

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 516A(c)(1) of the Act.

Dated: September 23, 2010.

Paul Piquado,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010-24321 Filed 9-24-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-560-824]

Certain Coated Paper Suitable for High-Quality Print Graphics Using Sheet-Fed Presses from Indonesia: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) has determined that countervailable subsidies are being provided to producers and exporters of

certain coated paper suitable for high-quality print graphics using sheet-fed presses (coated paper) from Indonesia. For information on the estimated countervailing duty rates, please see the "Suspension of Liquidation" section, below.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 27, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gene Calvert or Nicholas Czajkowski, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3586 and (202) 482-1395, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Case History

The following events have occurred since the announcement of the preliminary determination, which was published in the **Federal Register** on March 9, 2010. See *Certain Coated Paper from Indonesia: Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Alignment of Final Countervailing Duty Determination with Final Antidumping Duty Determination*, 75 FR 10761 (March 9, 2010) (*Preliminary Determination*).

The Department issued additional supplemental questionnaires to the Government of Indonesia (GOI), and to cross-owned company respondents PT Pabrik Kertas Tjiwi Kimia Tbk., PT Indah Kiat Pulp and Paper Tbk., and PT Pindo Deli Pulp and Paper Mills (collectively, APP/SMG) regarding the programs under investigation. Parties submitted timely responses to these supplemental questionnaires on May 11 and May 26 (the GOI and APP/SMG) and June 25 (the GOI only). On April 7 and April 8, APP/SMG and Appleton Coated LLC, NewPage Corporation, S.D. Warren Company d/b/a Sappi Fine Paper North America, and the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union (collectively, Petitioners), respectively, submitted timely requests for a hearing pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(c), which they both subsequently withdrew on August 6, 2010.

The Department conducted verification of the questionnaire responses submitted by the GOI and APP/SMG from June 28, 2010 through July 8, 2010. The Department issued the final business-proprietary version of the verification reports on August 6, 2010. We received case briefs from the GOI and APP/SMG, jointly, and from Petitioners on August 16. We received

⁷ See the Department's memorandum entitled, "2007 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China: Due Date for Interested Parties to Submit Comments on Draft Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Remand," dated July 16, 2010.

⁸ See *Timken*, 893 F.2d at 341.

⁹ See NSR Final Results.