

will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability of the draft EIS 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 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.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Al Vazquez, District Ranger, or Robin Bryant, Interdisciplinary Team Leader, may be contacted by phone at (530) 258-2141 for more information about the supplemental environmental impact statement or at the Almanor Ranger District, P.O. Box 767, Chester, CA 96020.

*Responsible Official and Mailing Address:* Laurie Tippin, Forest Supervisor, 2550 Riverside Drive, Susanville, CA 96130, is the responsible official for the Record of Decision.

Dated: December 1, 2006.

**Jeff Withroe,**

*Acting Forest Supervisor, Lassen National Forest.*

[FR Doc. 06-9567 Filed 12-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5410-99-M

## COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

### Sunshine Act Notice

**DATE AND TIME:** Thursday, December 14, 2006, 9 a.m.

**PLACE:** U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 624 Ninth Street, NW., Rm. 540, Washington, DC 20425.

The meeting is also accessible to the public through the following: Call-In Number: 1-800-597-0731. Access Code Number: 43783773. Federal Relay Service: 1-800-877-8339.

### Meeting Agenda

- I. Approval of Agenda
- II. Approval of Minutes of November 17, Meeting
- III. Announcements
- IV. Staff Director's Report
- V. Management and Operations
  - Quality Information Guidelines
  - Proposed Rule on Conduct Regulations
  - Proposed Rule on Outside Employment
  - Strategic Planning
  - Procedures for Briefing Reports
  - Procedures for National Office Work Products
- VI. Program Planning
  - January Business Meeting and Briefing
  - Revised 2007 Business Meeting and Briefing Calendar
  - Affirmative Action in Law Schools Briefing Report
  - Campus anti-Semitism Public Education Campaign
  - Kentucky SAC Report
  - Florida SAC Report
- VII. State Advisory Committee Issues
  - California SAC Members
  - Arizona SAC
- VIII. Future Agenda Items
- X. Adjourn

### Briefing Agenda

- Commission Briefing: Elementary and Secondary School Desegregation
- Introductory Remarks by Chairman
  - Speakers' Presentation
  - Questions by Commissioners and Staff Director

### CONTACT PERSON FOR FURTHER

**INFORMATION:** Manuel Alba, Press and Communications (202) 376-7700.

**David P. Blackwood,**

*General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 06-9584 Filed 12-4-06; 4:21 pm]

BILLING CODE 6335-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Foreign-Trade Zones Board

Docket T-5-2006

### Foreign-Trade Zone 196 - Fort Worth, Texas, Application for Temporary/Interim Manufacturing Authority, Motorola, Inc. (Mobile Phone Kitting)

An application has been submitted to the Acting Executive Secretary of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the Alliance Corridor, Inc., grantee of FTZ 196, requesting temporary/interim manufacturing (T/IM) authority within FTZ 196, at the facilities of Motorola, Inc. (Motorola) located in Fort Worth, Texas. The application was filed on November 28, 2006.

The Motorola facilities (3,800 employees, annual capacity for up to 50 - 60 million mobile phone sets) are located at multiple locations (including those of affiliates and third-party contractors) within Sites 1 and 2 of FTZ 196, and include 4801 Westport Parkway and 15005 Peterson Court, in Fort Worth, Texas. Under T/IM procedures, Motorola has requested authority to process (kit) certain imported components into mobile phone sets (HTSUS 8525.20 - the phones enter the United States duty-free). The company may source the following potentially dutiable components from abroad for processing under T/IM authority, as described in its application: batteries (HTSUS 8507.80), power supplies (HTSUS 8504.40), lithium batteries (HTSUS 8507.30), cables (HTSUS 8544.41), housing assemblies (HTSUS 8529.90), and printed circuit connectors (HTSUS 8536.69). Duty rates on these inputs range from duty-free to 3.4 percent, *ad valorem*. T/IM authority could be granted for a period of up to two years. Motorola has also submitted a request for permanent FTZ manufacturing authority (for which Board filing is pending), which includes a range of additional inputs.

FTZ T/IM procedures would allow Motorola to elect the finished-product duty rate for the imported components listed above. The application indicates that most of the FTZ savings would result from choosing the duty-free rate on mobile phones for imported batteries (HTSUS 8507.80, duty rate - 3.4%). The company indicates that it would also realize logistical/paperwork savings and duty-deferral savings under FTZ procedures. Motorola's application states that the above-cited savings from zone procedures could help improve the company's international competitiveness.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the Board's Acting Executive Secretary at the following address: Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 2814B, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; Tel: (202) 482-2862. The closing period for their receipt is January 8, 2007.

A copy of the application will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board's Executive Secretary at the address listed above.

Dated: November 28, 2006.

**Andrew McGilvray,**

*Acting Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E6-20784 Filed 12-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-549-813]

#### **Canned Pineapple Fruit from Thailand: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**SUMMARY:** On August 4, 2006, the Department of Commerce (Department) published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results and partial preliminary rescission of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit from Thailand. This review covers two manufacturers/exporters: Vita Food Factory (1989) Ltd. (Vita) and Tropical Food Industries Co., Ltd. (TROFCO). The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005. In these final results, we have made no changes to the weighted-average dumping margins determined for Vita and TROFCO in the preliminary results of this administrative review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 7, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Magd Zalok or Howard Smith, AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-4162 and (202) 482-5193, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **Background**

On August 4, 2006, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit from Thailand. See *Canned Pineapple Fruit from Thailand: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 44256 (August 4, 2006) (*Preliminary Results*). On August 23, 2006, we received a case brief from Vita in response to the Department's invitation to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. On September 11, 2006, we received a rebuttal brief from the petitioners. The Department received no comments regarding its preliminary decision to base TROFCO's margin on adverse facts available (AFA).

#### **Scope of the Order**

The product covered by the order is canned pineapple fruit, defined as pineapple processed and/or prepared into various product forms, including rings, pieces, chunks, tidbits, and crushed pineapple, that is packed and cooked in metal cans with either pineapple juice or sugar syrup added. Imports of canned pineapple fruit are currently classifiable under subheadings 2008.20.0010 and 2008.20.0090 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). HTSUS 2008.20.0010 covers canned pineapple fruit packed in a sugar-based syrup; HTSUS 2008.20.0090 covers canned pineapple fruit packed without added sugar (*i.e.*, juice-packed). The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the merchandise covered by this order is dispositive.

#### **Partial Final Rescission of Review**

As stated in the *Preliminary Results*, the Department concluded that Prachuab Fruit Canning Co., Ltd. (PRAFT) made no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. Therefore, consistent with the *Preliminary Results*, and in accordance with 19 CFR § 351.213(d)(3), we are rescinding the instant review with respect to PRAFT. We received no comments on the Department's decision in the *Preliminary Results* to rescind this review with respect to PRAFT.

#### **Analysis of Comments Received**

The one issue raised in Vita's case brief is addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated concurrently herewith (Decision Memorandum),

which is adopted herein, by reference (that issue is identified in the appendix attached to this notice). The Decision Memorandum is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the Herbert C. Hoover Building, and may be accessed on the Web at <http://trade.gov/ia/index.asp>, "**Federal Register Notices.**"

#### **Final Results of Review**

We determined that the following weighted-average percentage margins exist for the period July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Margin (percent)
Vita Food Factory (1989) Ltd. ....	16.14
Tropical Food Industries Co., Ltd. ....	51.16

#### **Assessment**

The Department has determined, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR § 351.212(b)(1), we calculated importer/customer-specific assessment rates for Vita's subject merchandise. Since Vita did not report the entered value for its sales, we calculated per-unit assessment rates for its merchandise by summing, on an importer or customer-specific basis, the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales of subject merchandise to the importer or customer and dividing this amount by the total quantity of those sales. To determine whether the per-unit duty assessment rates were *de minimis* (*i.e.*, less than 0.50 percent *ad valorem*), in accordance with the requirement set forth in 19 CFR § 351.106(c)(2), we calculated importer/customer-specific *ad valorem* ratios based on adjusted export prices. Where the importer/customer-specific assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess this rate uniformly on all appropriate entries. For TROFCO, the respondent receiving a dumping margin based upon AFA, we will instruct CBP to liquidate entries according to the AFA *ad valorem* rate. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of the final results of review.

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003. See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003). This clarification applies to POR entries of subject merchandise produced by companies included in these final