

Therefore, in accordance with § 319.56–5(c), we are announcing the Administrator's determination that the States of New South Wales, Northern Territory, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, and Victoria meet the criteria of § 319.56–5(a) and (b) with respect to freedom from Medfly and the State of Western Australia meets the criteria of § 319.56–5(a) and (b) with respect to freedom from Queensland fruit fly. After reviewing the comments we receive on this notice, we will announce our decision regarding the status of these areas with respect to their freedom from Medfly and Queensland fruit fly. If the Administrator's determination remains unchanged, we will amend the list of pest-free areas to list the States of New South Wales, Northern Territory, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, and Victoria as free of Medfly and the State of Western Australia as free of Queensland fruit fly.

Done in Washington, DC, this 7th day of September 2011.

Kevin Shea,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2011–23431 Filed 9–13–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS–2011–0089]

Oral Rabies Vaccine Trial; Availability of an Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We are advising the public that an environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact have been prepared by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service relative to an oral rabies vaccination field trial in West Virginia. Based on its finding of no significant impact, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that an environmental impact statement need not be prepared.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Dennis Slate, Rabies Program Coordinator, Wildlife Services, APHIS, 59 Chennell Drive, Suite 7, Concord, NH 03301; (603) 223–9623. To obtain copies of the environmental assessment or finding of no significant impact, contact Ms. Beth Kabert, Environmental Coordinator, Wildlife Services, 140–C Locust Grove Road, Pittstown, NJ 08867;

(908) 735–5654, fax (908) 735–0821, or e-mail beth.e.kabert@aphis.usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Wildlife Services (WS) program in the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) cooperates with Federal agencies, State and local governments, and private individuals to research and implement the best methods of managing conflicts between wildlife and human health and safety, agriculture, property, and natural resources. Wildlife-borne diseases that can affect domestic animals and humans are among the types of conflicts that APHIS–WS addresses. Wildlife is the dominant reservoir of rabies in the United States.

On August 8, 2011, we published in the **Federal Register** (76 FR 48119–48120, Docket No. APHIS–2011–0089) a notice¹ in which we announced the availability, for public review and comment, of an environmental assessment (EA) that examined the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed field trial to test the safety and efficacy of an experimental oral rabies vaccine for wildlife in West Virginia.

We solicited comments on the EA for 30 days ending September 7, 2011. We received 13 comments by that date. They were from private citizens and representatives of public health, agriculture, and natural resources agencies in the United States and Canada. Nine of the commenters fully supported the proposed field trial. The remaining commenters presented specific questions or suggestions regarding the field trial or the experimental vaccine. All the comments, and APHIS' responses to those comments, are presented in an appendix to the EA (see footnote 1).

In this document, we are advising the public of our finding of no significant impact (FONSI) regarding the implementation of a field trial to test the safety and efficacy of the AdRG1.3 wildlife rabies vaccine in Greenbrier, Summers, and Monroe Counties, WV, including portions of U.S. Forest Service National Forest System lands, but excluding Wilderness Areas. The finding, which is based on the EA, reflects our determination that the distribution of this experimental wildlife rabies vaccine will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

¹ To view the notice, EA, risk assessments, the comments we received, and the FONSI, go to <http://www.regulations.gov/fdmspublic/component/main?main=DocketDetail&d=APHIS-2011-0089>.

The EA and FONSI may be viewed on the APHIS Web site at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/regulations/ws/ws_nepa_environmental_documents.shtml and on the *Regulations.gov* Web site (see footnote 1). Copies of the EA and FONSI are also available for public inspection at USDA, room 1141, South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC, between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Persons wishing to inspect copies are requested to call ahead on (202) 690–2817 to facilitate entry into the reading room. In addition, copies may be obtained as described under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

The EA and FONSI have been prepared in accordance with: (1) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), (2) regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), (3) USDA regulations implementing NEPA (7 CFR part 1b), and (4) APHIS' NEPA Implementing Procedures (7 CFR part 372).

Done in Washington, DC, this 8th day of September 2011.

Kevin Shea,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2011–23587 Filed 9–13–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Fremont and Winema Resource Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting/field tour.

SUMMARY: The Fremont and Winema Resource Advisory Committee will meet in Bly, Oregon and travel to various project sites along the North Fork of the Sprague River, for the purpose of monitoring and viewing active and completed Title II watershed restoration projects. The committee operates in compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, under the provisions of Title II of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (Pub. L. 110–343) of 2000 (reauthorized in 2008).

DATES: The tour will be held on Oct 6, 2011 9 a.m.–14 p.m.

ADDRESS: The tour will commence from Bly, OR onto the Fremont-Winema Forest and along the North Fork of the Sprague River including a private ranch.

Send written comments to Fremont and Winema Resource Advisory Committee, c/o USDA Forest Service, Klamath Ranger District, 2819 Dahlia, Suite A, Klamath Falls, Oregon or electronically to agowan@fs.fed.us.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amy Gowan, Designated Federal Official, c/o Klamath Ranger District, 2819 Dahlia, Suite A, Klamath Falls, Oregon, telephone (541) 883-6741 or Lucinda Nolan RAC Coordinator 1301 South G Street, Lakeview, Oregon 97630, telephone (541) 947-6277.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: There will be an information packet available the day of the tour. It will include an agenda, a map depicting the location of projects to be monitored, original Title II project proposals and associated project status reports. All Fremont and Winema Resource Advisory Committee Meetings are open to the public. Interested citizens are encouraged to attend, however they will need to provide their own transportation.

Dated: September 7, 2011.

Amy Gowan,

Designated Federal Official.

[FR Doc. 2011-23477 Filed 9-13-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-851]

Certain Preserved Mushrooms From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Rescission in Part

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* September 14, 2011.

SUMMARY: On March 8, 2011, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from the People's Republic of China (PRC). See *Certain Preserved Mushrooms From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Rescission in Part, and Intent to Rescind in Part*, 76 FR 12704 (March 8, 2011) (*Preliminary Results*). Based upon our analysis of comments received from interested parties, we made changes to the margin calculations for the final results.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Baker, Scott Hoefke, or Robert James, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-2924, (202) 482-4947 or (202) 482-0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 8, 2011, the Department published the *Preliminary Results* of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from the PRC. On March 28, 2011, Monterrey Mushrooms, Inc. (Petitioner), Blue Field (Sichuan) Food Industrial Co., Ltd. (Blue Field) and Xiamen International Trade & Industrial Co., Ltd. (XITIC) submitted additional information for proposed surrogate values. On April 21, 2011, Blue Field submitted comments regarding the *Preliminary Results*.¹

In the *Preliminary Results*, the Department invited interested parties to submit case briefs within 30 days of publication of the *Preliminary Results* and rebuttal briefs within five days after the due date for filing case briefs. See *Preliminary Results*, 76 FR at 12710. We received case briefs from Guangxi Jisheng Foods, Inc. (Jisheng) and XITIC on April 7, 2011, and a case brief from Petitioner on April 8, 2011. On April 12, 2011, the Department extended the due date for rebuttal briefs by two days. Rebuttal briefs from XITIC and Petitioner were received April 12, 2011, and April 15, 2011, respectively. On April 20, 2011, we extended the due date for Blue Field's rebuttal brief until April 25, 2011.² On April 21, 2011, we received a rebuttal brief from Blue Field.

On June 6, 2011, the Department issued a letter to parties soliciting comments regarding the conversion factor used for the surrogate value of manure in the *Preliminary Results*. On June 13, 2011, the Department received comments from both the petitioner and XITIC concerning this issue.

On July 13, 2011 we extended the due date for the final results of this review by sixty days. See *Certain Preserved Mushrooms From the People's Republic of China; Extension of time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty*

¹ Blue Field had originally submitted comments on March 14, 2011. However, those comments were deemed to have new information and were returned to Blue Field on April 15, 2011. See letter to Blue Field, dated April 15, 2011.

² See Memorandum to the File, From Fred Baker, Analyst, Subject: Due Date for Rebuttal Brief from Blue Field (Sichuan) Food Industrial Co., Ltd. (Blue Field), dated April 20, 2011.

Administrative Review, 76 FR 41215 (July 13, 2011).

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this review are addressed in the memorandum entitled, "Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results in the Administrative Review of Certain Preserved Mushrooms from the People's Republic of China," which is dated concurrently with and adopted by this notice (Decision Memorandum). A list of the issues raised, and to which we respond in the Decision Memorandum, is attached to this notice as an appendix. The Decision Memorandum is a public document, and is on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU), Main Commerce Building, Room 7046, and is accessible on the Department's Web site at <http://www.trade.gov/ia>. The paper copy and electronic version of the memorandum are identical in content.

Final Rescission in Part

In the *Preliminary Results*, the Department announced its intent to rescind the review with respect to five companies who claimed they made no shipments of subject merchandise during the period of review (POR). We made inquiries with CBP as to whether any shipments were entered with respect to these five companies during the POR. See CBP message numbers 0347302, 0347303, 0347304, 0347305, and 0347306, all dated December 13, 2010. We received no responses from CBP to those inquiries. We also examined CBP information used in the selection of the mandatory respondents to further confirm no shipments by these companies during the POR. See the attachment to "Letter from Robert James to All Interested Parties" dated April 2, 2010. The five companies are: Dujiangyan Xingda Foodstuff Co., Fujian Pinghe Baofeng Canned Foods, Fujian Zishan Group Co., Ltd., Longhai Guangfa Food Co., and Xiamen Longhuai Import & Export Co. See *Preliminary Results* 76 FR at 12705. Because the Department did not receive any information to the contrary, we continue to find that these companies did not make any shipments during the POR. Thus, for these final results, we are rescinding this review, with respect to the five above-named companies, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

Period of Review

The POR is February 1, 2009, through January 31, 2010.