instrument and instructions should be directed to Amber Himes, (206) 526–4221 or *Amber.Hines@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The purpose of this data collection program is to improve commercial fisheries socioeconomic data for North Pacific fisheries, using the community as the unit of reporting and analysis. Communities are often the focus of policy mandates (*e.g.* National Standard 8 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Management Act (MSA), social impact assessments under the National Environmental Policy Act and MSA, North Pacific Fishery Management Council (NPFMC) programmatic management goals, etc.) and are frequently a recognized stakeholder in NPFMC deliberations and programs. However, much of the existing commercial socioeconomic data is collected and organized around different units of analysis, such as counties (boroughs), fishing firms, vessels, sectors, and gear groups. It is often difficult to aggregate or disaggregate these data for analysis at the individual community or regional level. In addition, at present, some relevant community level socioeconomic data are simply not collected at all. The NPFMC, the Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC), and community stakeholder organizations, have identified ongoing collection of community level economic and socioeconomic information, specifically related to commercial fisheries, as a priority.

The proposed data collection will include information on community revenues based in the fisheries economy, population fluctuations, vessel expenditures in ports, fisheries infrastructure available in the community, support sector business operations in the community, community participation in fisheries management, effects of fisheries management decisions on the community, and demographic information on commercial fisheries participants from the community. The information collected in this program will capture the most relevant and pressing types of data needed for socioeconomic analyses of communities.

II. Method of Collection

The method of data collection will be a survey sent by mail (and by e-mail where possible).

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: State, local, or tribal government.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 524.

Estimated Time Per Response: 1 hour.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 524.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $0 in recordkeeping/reporting costs.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: September 21, 2010.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2010–24239 Filed 9–27–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 56–2010]

Foreign-Trade Zone 203—Moses Lake, WA; Application for Reorganization and Expansion Under Alternative Site Framework

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) by the Port of Moses Lake Public Corporation, grantee of FTZ 203, requesting authority to reorganize and expand the zone under the alternative site framework (ASF) adopted by the Board (74 FR 1170, 1/12/09; correction 74 FR 3987, 1/22/09). The ASF is an option for grantees for the establishment or reorganization of general-purpose zones and can permit significantly greater flexibility in the designation of new "usage-driven" FTZ sites for operators/users located within a grantee's "service area" in the context of the Board's standard 2,000-acre activation limit for a general-purpose zone project. The application was submitted pursuant to the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR part 400). It was formally filed on September 23, 2010.

FTZ 203 was approved by the Board on October 18, 1994 (Board Order 702, 59 FR 54433, 10/31/94). The current zone project includes the following site: *Site 1* (316 acres)—Port of Moses Lake Industrial Park, located within the Grant County International Airport complex, Moses Lake, Washington.

The grantee's proposed service area under the ASF would include all of Benton, Chelan, Columbia, Douglas, Franklin, Grant, Kittitas, Lincoln and Walla Walla Counties, as well as portions of Okanogan and Yakima Counties, Washington, as described in the application. If approved, the grantee would be able to serve sites throughout the service area based on companies' needs for FTZ designation. The proposed service area is within and adjacent to the Moses Lake Customs and Border Protection port of entry.

The applicant is requesting authority to reorganize its existing zone project to include the existing site as a "magnet" site. The ASF allows for the possible exemption of one magnet site from the "sunset" time limits that generally apply to sites under the ASF, and the applicant proposes that Site 1 be so exempted. The applicant is also requesting approval of the following initial "usage-driven" sites in Grant County: *Proposed Site 2* (38 acres)—Zip Truck Line, Inc., 13957 Road 1.9 NE, Moses Lake; and, *Proposed Site 3* (60 acres)—SGL Automotive Carbon Fibers, LLC, 8781 Randolph Road NE, Moses Lake. Because the ASF only pertains to establishing or reorganizing a general-purpose zone, the application would have no impact on FTZ 203's authorized subzone.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, Christopher Kemp of the FTZ Staff is designated examiner to evaluate and analyze the facts and information presented in the application and case record and to report findings and recommendations to the Board.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is November 29, 2010. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the

subsequent 15-day period to December 13, 2010.

A copy of the application will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 2111, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the "Reading Room" section of the Board's Web site, which is accessible via *http://www.trade.gov/ftz.* For further information, contact Christopher Kemp at *Christopher.Kemp@trade.gov* or (202) 482–0862.

Dated: September 23, 2010.

Elizabeth Whiteman,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2010–24319 Filed 9–27–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–533–821]

Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From India: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony with Final Results of Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On September 13, 2010, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) sustained the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) results of redetermination pursuant to the CIT's remand in *United States Steel Corporation, et al. v. United States et al. and Essar Steel Limited v. United States et al.*, Slip Op. 09–152, Remand Order (December 30, 2009)(*Essar*). *See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand*, dated July 15, 2010 (found at http://ia.ita.doc.gov/remands); and United States Steel Corporation, et al. v. United States et al. and Essar Steel Limited v. United States et al., Slip Op. 10–104 (September 13, 2010) (*Essar*). 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 of the countervailing duty order on certain hot–rolled carbon steel flat products (HRCS) from India covering the period of review (POR) of January 1, 2006, through December 31, 2006. *See Certain Hot–Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from India: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 40295 (July 14, 2008) (*Final Results*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (I&D Memorandum).

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 28, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gayle Longest, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20230; telephone (202) 482–3338.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 14, 2008, the Department published its final results in the countervailing duty administrative review of HRCS from India covering the POR of January 1, 2006, through December 31, 2006. *See Final Results*. In the *Final Results*, the Department did not include central sales taxes paid on domestic purchases of iron ore lumps and for high–grade iron ore fines because we did not have information on import duties and other taxes and fees payable on imports of iron ore to be included in the calculation of the benchmark. *See* I&D Memorandum at "Sale of High–Grade Iron Ore for Less Than Adequate Remuneration" section and Comment 4. In *Essar*, the CIT determined that the Department's *Final Results* were not supported by substantial evidence on the record, and it remanded to the Department the issue of the deduction of Central Sales Tax from the government price in order for the Department to reevaluate the record evidence supporting this decision.

Moreover, subsequent to the *Final Results*, we discovered that the transportation and delivery charges (*i.e.*, all transportation and handling costs, duties and fees) for iron ore lumps and fines from Vizag port to Hazira port had not been included in either the iron ore lumps or fines calculations. Therefore, the we asked the court for a voluntary remand to adjust Essar's delivered purchase price for fines from NMDC to include missing delivery charges. In *Essar*, the CIT granted the Department's request for a voluntary remand to correct the freight calculations for Essar's purchases of iron ore fines from the National Mineral Development Corporation (NMDC). Specifically, the CIT ordered the Department to adjust the government price for iron ore lumps and fines used in the price comparison to measure the adequacy of remuneration (1) to correct freight calculations for Essar's purchases of iron ore fines from the NMDC and (2) to account for slurry pipe transporation cost to Vizag.

On July 15, 2010, the Department issued its final results of redetermination pursuant to *Essar*. The remand redetermination explained that, in accordance with the CIT's instructions, the Department has made redeterminations with respect to the calculation of the government price for iron ore lumps and fines as well as Essar's purchases of lumps and fines for the following three issues. First, we adjusted our iron ore calculations to measure the adequacy of remuneration of sales of lumps and fines by the GOI to Essar to include Central Sales Tax for Essar's purchase of iron ore lumps and high–grade iron ore fines from the NMDC and to include import duties payable on iron ore with regard to the corresponding benchmark prices. Second, we corrected the government price for iron ore lumps and fines to address erroneous freight calculations for Essar's purchases of iron ore from NMDC. Third, for fines purchases from NMDC made on or after the date the slurry pipeline became operational, we have replaced the per metric ton (MT) rail cost with the per MT slurry transportation costs. The Department's redetermination resulted in changes to the *Final Results* for Essar's net subsidy rate concerning the sale of iron ore for less than adequate remuneration program from 13.21 percent to 19.35 percent. Therefore, the Department's redetermination resulted in the total net countervailable subsidy rate received by Essar in the *Final Results* changing from 17.50 percent to 23.64 percent.

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*, 893 F.2d at 341, 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. The CIT's decision in *Essar* on September 13, 2010, constitutes a final decision of that court that is not in harmony with the Department's *Final Results*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*. Accordingly, the Department will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise pending the expiration of the period of appeal or, if appealed, pending a final and conclusive court decision. In the event the CIT's ruling is not appealed or, if appealed, upheld by the CAFC, the Department will issue an amended final results consistent with