Estimated Dates for Filing

The draft EIS is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review by November 2006. At that time EPA will publish a Notice of Availability of the draft EIS in the **Federal Register.** The comment period on the draft EIS will be 45 days from the date the EPA publishes the Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register.** It is very important that those interested in the management of this area participate at that time.

The final EIS is scheduled to be completed by April 2007. In the final EIS, the Forest Service is required to respond to comments and responses received during the comment period that pertain to the environmental consequences discussed in the draft EIS and applicable laws, regulations, and policies considered in making a decision regarding the proposal.

Comment Requested

This notice of intent continues the scoping process which guides the development of the environmental impact statement. The Forest Service will be seeking information, comments and assistance from Federal, State and local agencies and other individuals or organization that may be interested in, or affected by, the proposed action. While public participation in this analysis is welcome at any time, comments received within 30 days of the publication of this notice will be especially useful in the preparation of the EIS.

Electronic Access and Filing Addresses

Comments may be sent by electronic mail (e-mail) to *comments-pacificsouthwest-six-rivers-mad-river@fs.fed.us.* Please reference the Little Doe and Low Gulch Timber Sale Project on the subject line. Also, include your name and mailing address with your comments so documents pertaining to this project may be mailed to you.

Early Notice of Importance of Public Participation in Subsequent Environmental Review

A draft environmental impact statement will be prepared for comment. The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register.**

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* v. *NRDC,* 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental impact statement stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon* v. *Hodel,* 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc.* v. *Harris,* 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45-day comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. 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: May 12, 2006.

William Metz,

Acting Forest Supervisor, Six Rivers National Forest.

[FR Doc. E6–7556 Filed 5–17–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Ravalli County Resource Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Ravalli County Resource Advisory Committee will be meeting to discuss 2006 projects, several guest speakers, and hold a short public forum (question and answer session). The meeting is being held pursuant to the authorities in the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463) and under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106–393). The meeting is open to the public.

DATES: The meeting will be held on May 23, 2006, 6:30 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Bitterroot National Forest Supervisor Office, Conference Room, 1801 North First Street, Hamilton, Montana. Send written comments to Dan Ritter, District Ranger, Stevensville Ranger District, 88 Main Street, Stevensville, MT 59870, by facsimile (406) 777–7423, or electronically to *dritter@fs.fed.us.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel G. Ritter, Stevensville District Ranger and Designated Federal Officer, Phone: (406) 777–5461.

Dated: May 11, 2006.

David T. Bull,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 06–4645 Filed 5–17–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–846]

Certain Hot–Rolled Flat–Rolled Carbon–Quality Steel Products from Japan: Notice of Amended Final Determination Pursuant to Court Decision.

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

SUMMARY: On February 22, 2006, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) issued an order affirming the Department of Commerce's (Department) Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand filed by the Department of Commerce on December 2, 2003 (Redetermination). *See Nippon Steel*

Corporation v. United States, SLIP OP. 06–23 (CIT 2006). The remand redetermination arose out of the final determination of sales at less than fair value in the antidumping duty investigation of hot–rolled flat–rolled carbon–quality steel products from Japan. Because all litigation in this matter has now concluded, the Department is issuing its amended final determination in accordance with the CIT's decision.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 18, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kimberley Hunt, 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) 482–1272.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

BACKGROUND

On May 6, 1999, the Department published a *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Hot–Rolled Flat–Rolled Carbon–Quality Steel Products from Japan*, 64 FR 24329 (*May 6, 1999*) (Final Determination) covering the period of investigation (POI) July 1, 1997 through June 30, 1998. On June 29, 1999, the antidumping duty order was published. *See Notice of the Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Hot–Rolled Flat–Rolled Carbon–Quality Steel Products From Japan*, 64 FR 34778 (June 29, 1999). Both Bethlehem Steel Corporation, U.S. Steel Group, Ispat Inland, Inc., and LTV Steel Company, Inc. (collectively, Petitioners), and Nippon Steel Corporation (Nippon), a respondent, contested various aspects of the *Final Determination*.

On October 26, 2000, the CIT issued its opinion and remanded to the Department an issue in the *Final Determination* for reconsideration: specifically, the CIT asked the Department to assess its rejection of Nippon's untimely submitted weight conversion factor and its assignment of a margin to the affected sales based upon adverse facts available and instructed the Department to determine whether Nippon acted to the best of its ability according to 19 U.S.C. § 1677e(b) in submitting the requested weight conversion factor the Department. The court also instructed the Department to issue a policy statement on *ex parte* memoranda. Additionally, the CIT upheld the Department on several issues. Only one is pertinent here; namely, that the CIT affirmed the Department's methodology for determining the starting U.S. price from Nippon's invoices, which converted yen paid from the buyer to Nippon into U.S. dollars and used the converted amount from the invoice as the U.S. starting price, as opposed to using the U.S. dollar amount Nippon had submitted in its response, which had been negotiated between the parties and was an agreed upon U.S. dollar amount. *See Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States*, 118 F. Supp. 2d 1366 (CIT 2000) (*Nippon I*).

Pursuant to the CIT's decision, the Department issued its remand redetermination concluding that Nippon ''failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability'' and again assigned a margin to the affected sales based upon facts available, as opposed to using the actual, untimely reported weight conversion factor submitted by Nippon. *See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand: Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States*, Consol. Ct. No. 99–08–00466 (December 8, 2000) (*First Remand Redetermination*) (available at *http://ia.ita.doc.gov*).

Nippon contested various aspects of the Department's *First Remand Redetermination*. On April 20, 2001, the CIT issued its opinion regarding the Department's *First Remand Redetermination* and remanded, in part, the Department's results. The CIT found that the *ex parte* policy statement conformed to the requirements of the court's injunction regarding the placement on the record of memoranda detailing *ex parte* communications between parties and Department officials. However, the court remanded the case to the Department, specifically stating that it was not remanding the case for further examination of the adverse inference issue. Rather, the court stated that the Department's conclusion that Nippon ''failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability'' was unsupported by substantial evidence and instructed the Department to re–calculate Nippon's dumping margin without using adverse facts available. *See Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States*, 146 F. Supp. 2d 835 (CIT 2001) (*Nippon II*).

Pursuant to the CIT's decision, the Department changed its analysis of Nippon's weight conversion factor and selected weighted–average margins for theoretical weight sales as non–adverse facts available. *See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand: Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States*, Consol. Ct. No. 99–08–00466 (June 19, 2001) (*Second Remand Redetermination*) (available as part of the CIT court record). Nippon contested the Department's *Second Remand Redetermination*. On October 12, 2001, the CIT issued its opinion regarding the Department's Second Remand Redetermination, remanding the case to the Department to devise a new approach to the determination of neutral facts available with respect to Nippon's weight conversion factor, stating that the Department unreasonably selected weighted–average margins for theoretical weight sales as non–adverse facts available, where the margins reflected a weight conversion factor that was implausible. *See Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States*, SLIP OP. 01–122 (CIT October 12, 2001) (*Nippon III*).

Pursuant to the CIT's decision, the Department issued its third redetermination and modified its approach by substituting a margin based on a weighted average of all reported U.S. actual–weight sales. *See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand: Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States*, Consol. Ct. No. 99–08–00466 (November 13, 2001) (*Third Remand Redetermination*) (available as part of the CIT court record). Nippon contested the Department's *Third Remand Redetermination*, stating that the Department did not meaningfully change its methodology, as ordered by the CIT in *Nippon III*. On December 27, 2001, the CIT issued its opinion regarding the Department's *Third Remand Redetermination*, stating that it ''refuse{d} to further extend litigation by reopening the issue'' and ordering the Department to use Nippon's untimely reported weight conversion factor. *See Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States*, SLIP OP. 01–152 (CIT December 27, 2001) (*Nippon IV*).

Both the U.S. Government and certain petitioners, Bethlehem Steel and U.S. Steel Group (collectively Bethlehem), appealed the decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC). Specifically, both appellants argued that the CIT erred in rejecting the Department's original determination to apply partial adverse facts available with respect to Nippon's weight conversion factor because the Department's determination was supported by substantial evidence. Bethlehem separately argued that the CIT erred by holding that the Department's determination of a yen–based U.S. starting price to be used for Nippon's U.S. sales was supported by substantial evidence.

The CAFC held that the Department's application of partial adverse facts available was supported by substantial evidence and otherwise in accordance with the law but that the Department's methodology of calculating the U.S.

starting price was not in accordance with law. *Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States*, 337 F.3d 1373, 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2003). The CAFC reversed the CIT's decision to the extent that it held the opposite on any of these issues. The Department filed its fourth remand redetermination on December 2, 2003 and changed its methodology according to the CAFC's reversal of the CIT's decision on U.S. starting price and the use of partial adverse facts available for Nippon's weight conversion factor. *See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States 99–08–00466* (December 2, 2003) (*Fourth Remand Redetermination*). On February 22, 2006, the CIT sustained the Department's *Fourth Remand Redetermination*. *See Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States*, SLIP OP. 06–23 (CIT February 22, 2006).

In addition to the court decisions discussed above, the Government of Japan (GOJ) appealed, among other issues, the Department's application of adverse facts available for Nippon's weight conversion factor to the World Trade Organization (WTO). The GOJ did not appeal the U.S. starting price issue to the WTO. In its report, the WTO Appellate Body ruled that the Department acted inconsistently with the Antidumping Agreement in applying ''facts available'' to Nippon with regard to the reported weight conversion factor and found that the Department should have used Nippon's untimely submitted, actual weight conversion factor. The Department implemented the WTO Appellate Body's findings in a Section 129 Determination. *See Notice of Determination Under Section 129 of the Uruguay Round Agreement Act: Antidumping Measures on Certain Hot–Rolled, Flat–Rolled Carbon Quality Steel Products from Japan*, 67 FR 71936, 71939 (December 3, 2002) (*129 Determination*). The effective date of the *129 Determination* is November 22, 2002.

Because the effective date of the *129 Determination* predates the *Fourth Remand Redetermination*, the *Fourth Remand Redetermination* includes an analysis of the effect of the 129 Determination on the antidumping duty margin. *See Fourth Remand Redetermination* at 2. Accordingly, the Department calculated two margins for Nippon in the *Fourth Remand Redetermination*. The first margin, 21.12 percent, reflects the use of the same adverse inference made in the original investigation with respect to the margins for Nippon's theoretical weight sales, but changes the starting price for U.S. sales from converted yen to reported U.S. dollars. This margin applies to Nippon's unreviewed entries made prior to November 22, 2002, the effective date of the *129 Determination*. The second margin, 19.95 percent, reflects the various changes made to the original investigation margin as a result of the *129 Determination* and includes the use of Nippon's actual reported weight conversion factor, but also reflects the use of the reported U.S. dollar as the U.S. starting price. This margin applies to Nippon's unreviewed entries made on or after the effective date of the *129 Determination*, November 22, 2002.

AMENDED FINAL DETERMINATION

Because no party appealed the CIT's February 22, 2006 decision, there is now a final and conclusive decision in the court proceeding and we are thus amending the *Final Determination* to reflect the results of the *Fourth Remand Redetermination*, which addresses the CAFC's ruling as well as the changes to the margin pursuant to the *129 Determination*. The recalculated margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Weighted-average margin (percent)
From February 19, 1999 through November 21, 2002.	
Nippon Steel Corporation	**21.12%**
On or after November 22, 2002.	
Nippon Steel Corporation	**19.95%**

Accordingly, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1516a(e) and effective as of the publication of this notice, the Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to terminate the suspension of liquidation and proceed with liquidation of all appropriate entries entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after February 19, 1999, and before November 22, 2002 (the effective date of the *129 Determination*) at the rate of 21.12 percent, and all entries entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after November 22, 2002 (the effective date of the *129 Determination*) at the rate of 19.95 percent.

CASH DEPOSIT REQUIREMENTS

The Department will direct CBP to require, on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, a cash deposit rate of 19.95 percent for the subject merchandise. This cash deposit requirement, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of an administrative review of this order.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 735(d) and 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: May 12, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–7603 Filed 5–17–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–856]

Synthetic Indigo from the People's Republic of China: Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: On May 2, 2005, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated and the International Trade Commission (''ITC'') instituted the sunset review of the antidumping duty (''AD'') order on synthetic indigo from the People's Republic of China (''the PRC'') pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). *See Notice of Initiation of Five-year (''Sunset'') Reviews*, 70 FR 22632 (May 2, 2005) and *Institution of a Five-year Review concerning the Antidumping Duty Order on Synthetic Indigo from China*, 70 FR 22701 (May 2, 2005). Pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, the ITC determined that revocation of this AD order would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. *See Synthetic Indigo from China*, 71 FR 26109 (May 3, 2006). Therefore, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.222(i)(1)(iii), the Department is revoking the AD order on synthetic indigo from the PRC.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 19, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hilary E. Sadler, Esq., Office 8 of AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4340.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Scope of the Order

The products subject to this order are the deep blue synthetic vat dye known