the ESA. Owners of non-FERC dams often do not have regulatory oversight by a Federal agency and therefore, may not be aware of the requirements of the ESA and what this means to them. This survey will identify opportunities for fish passage improvements or dam removal that may fit into existing funding programs directed towards improving fish passage for diadromous fish species. Information from this survey will also be collected to educate NOAA on the current use, anticipated use, and community interest in small dams. This type of information will aid NMFS in developing tools to communicate and work effectively with dam owners within the GOM DPS. Information will be collected on current uses of dams, anticipated uses of dams, important issues or concerns to dam owners, and owners' interest in creating fish passage or removing dams. Known associations or organizations with an interest in the dams will also be identified.

Respondents will represent members of state and local agencies, private individuals and corporations, and commercial businesses. Results will be used to assist NMFS in identifying dam owners who are interested in discussing potential enhancements to Atlantic salmon habitats.

II. Method of Collection

The geographic spread of potential respondents is extensive and includes residents of Maine as well as nonresidents. Most respondents will be contacted via an initial letter and a follow-up telephone call. Personal interviews will be scheduled with a few respondents owning multiple (in excess of 5) dams and the information collected will be recorded electronically.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission (new information collection).

Affected Public: Individuals or households, non-profit institutions; State, local, or tribal government; Federal government, business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 309.

Estimated Time Per Response: 7 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 36.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $0 for record keeping/reporting.

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: November 22, 2010.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2010–29722 Filed 11–24–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–890]

Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People's Republic of China: Amended Final Results Pursuant to a Final Court Decision

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

SUMMARY: On September 17, 2010, the United States Court of International Trade (the "Court" or "CIT") sustained the U.S. Department of Commerce's (the "Department's") final results of redetermination pursuant to remand, wherein the Department determined to rescind the administrative review ("AR") with respect to Dongguan Bon Ten Furniture Co., Ltd. ("Bon Ten") pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(j) and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).[1] The period of review ("POR") is January 1, 2007, through December 31, 2007. As the Court's decision is now final and conclusive, the Department is amending the final results of the 2007 AR of wooden bedroom furniture ("WBF") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") to reflect the Department's redetermination to rescind the AR with respect to Bon Ten.[2]

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 26, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frances Veith, AD/CVD 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 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

[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* ("*Remand Results*"); *see also Dongguan Bon Ten Furniture Co., Ltd.* v. *United States,* Slip Op. 2010–106 (September 17, 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*").

[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.*

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 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, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire to Bon Ten, in which the Department 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, the Department 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] The Department 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 filed with the CIT its final remand redetermination, wherein it 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). On September 17, 2010, the CIT sustained the final remand redetermination. On September 27, 2010, the Department notified the public that the Court's decision in this case was not in harmony with the *Final Results* and the *Amended Final Results*.[8] The deadline to appeal the CIT's decision was November 16, 2010, 60 days after the date the CIT sustained the final results of redetermination on remand (*i.e.,* September 17, 2010). The time period for appealing the CIT's decision has expired and no party has appealed the CIT's decision to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Because there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this case, the Department is amending the final results of the 2007 AR with respect to Bon Ten.

Amended Final Results of Review

Rescission of Administrative Review, In Part

The remand redetermination explained that, in accordance with the CIT's instructions, the Department 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, the Department has determined that Bon Ten made 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, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(j) and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3). Therefore, the Department is amending the final results for Bon Ten, a company that was not selected for individual review, and the Department is rescinding the 2007 AR with respect to Bon Ten.

Cash Deposit Requirements

Pursuant to the final court decision, the Department will instruct CBP to collect a cash-deposit rate for Bon Ten, effective upon publication of these amended final results, 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] Bon Ten's cash deposit rate will remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.402(f)(3), failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and as explained in the APO itself. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: *November 19, 2010.*

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010–29825 Filed 11–24–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[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.

[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 Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review,* 75 FR 59208 (September 27, 2010).

[9] *See NSR Final Results.*