APHIS has evaluated the issues raised during the comment period and, where appropriate, has provided a discussion of these issues in our environmental assessment (EA).

After public comments are received on a completed petition, APHIS evaluates those comments and then provides a second opportunity for public involvement in our decisionmaking process. According to our public review process (see footnote 1), the second opportunity for public involvement follows one of two approaches, as described below.

If APHIS decides, based on its review of the petition and its evaluation and analysis of comments received during the 60-day public comment period on the petition, that the petition involves a GE organism that raises substantive new issues, APHIS will follow Approach 1 for public involvement. Under Approach 1, APHIS announces in the Federal Register the availability of APHIS' preliminary regulatory determination with its EA, preliminary finding of no significant impact (FONSI), and its plant pest risk assessment (PPRA) for a 30-day public review period. APHIS will evaluate any information received related to the petition and its supporting documents during the 30-day public review period. For this petition, we are using Approach 1.

If APHIS decides, based on its review of the petition and its evaluation and analysis of comments received during the 60-day public comment period on the petition, that the petition involves a GE organism that raises substantive new issues, APHIS will follow Approach 2. Under Approach 2, APHIS first solicits written comments from the public on a draft EA and PPRA for a 30-day comment period through the publication of a Federal Register notice. Then, after reviewing and evaluating the comments on the draft EA and PPRA and other information, APHIS will revise the PPRA as necessary and prepare a final EA and, based on the final EA, a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) decision document (either a FONSI or a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement).

As part of our decisionmaking process regarding a GE organism’s regulatory status, APHIS prepares a PPRA to assess the plant pest risk of the article. APHIS also prepares the appropriate environmental documentation—either an EA or an environmental impact statement—in accordance with NEPA, to provide the public with a review and analysis of any potential environmental impacts that may result if the petition request is approved.

APHIS has prepared a PPRA and has concluded that maize event MON 87427 is unlikely to pose a plant pest risk. In section 403 of the Plant Protection Act, “plant pest” is defined as any living stage of any of the following that can directly or indirectly injure, cause damage to, or cause disease in any plant or plant product: A protozoan, a nonhuman animal, a parasitic plant, a bacterium, a fungus, a virus or viroid, an infectious agent or other pathogen, or any article similar to or allied with any of the foregoing.

APHIS has prepared an EA in which we present two alternatives based on our analysis of data submitted by Monsanto, a review of other scientific data, field tests conducted under APHIS oversight, and comments received on the petition. APHIS is considering the following alternatives: (1) Take no action, i.e., APHIS would not change the regulatory status of maize event MON 87427 and it would continue to be a regulated article, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of maize event MON 87427.

The EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our EA and other pertinent scientific data, APHIS has reached a preliminary FONSI with regard to the preferred alternative identified in the EA.

Based on APHIS' analysis of field and laboratory data submitted by Monsanto, references provided in the petition, peer-reviewed publications, information analyzed in the EA, the PPRA, comments provided by the public on the petition, and discussion of issues in the EA, APHIS has determined that maize event MON 87427 is unlikely to pose a plant pest risk. We have therefore reached a preliminary decision to make a determination of nonregulated status of maize event MON 87427, whereby maize event MON 87427 would no longer be subject to our regulations governing the introduction of certain GE organisms.

We are making available for a 30-day review period APHIS' preliminary regulatory determination of maize event MON 87427, along with our PPRA, EA, and preliminary FONSI for the preliminary determination of nonregulated status. The EA, preliminary FONSI, PPRA, and our preliminary determination for maize event MON 87427, as well as the Monsanto petition and the comments received on the petition, are available as indicated under ADDRESSES and FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT above.

Copies of these documents may also be obtained from the person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.

After the 30-day review period closes, APHIS will review and evaluate any information received during the 30-day review period. If, after evaluating the information received, APHIS determines that we have not received substantive new information that would warrant APHIS altering our preliminary regulatory determination or FONSI, substantially changing the proposed action identified in the EA, or substantially changing the analysis of impacts in the EA, APHIS will notify the public through an announcement on our Web site of our final regulatory determination. If, however, APHIS determines that we have received substantive new information that would warrant APHIS altering our preliminary regulatory determination or FONSI, substantially changing the proposed action identified in the EA, or substantially changing the analysis of impacts in the EA, then APHIS will notify the public of our intent to conduct additional analysis and to prepare an amended EA, a new FONSI, and/or a revised PPRA, which would be made available for public review through the publication of a notice of availability in the Federal Register. APHIS will also notify the petitioner.


Done in Washington, DC, this 19th day of July 2013.

Kevin Shea,
Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2013–17935 Filed 7–24–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

ARCTIC RESEARCH COMMISSION

101st Commission Meeting

Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Arctic Research Commission will hold its 101st meeting in Unalaska, Alaska, on August 26–27, 2013. The business sessions, open to the public, will convene at 8:30 a.m.

The Agenda items include:
(1) Call to order and approval of the agenda
(2) Approval of the minutes from the 100th meeting
(3) Commissioners and staff report.

(4) Discussion and presentations concerning Arctic research activities

The focus of the meeting will be Arctic research activities in Unalaska, as well as reports and updates on other programs and research projects affecting the Arctic.

If you plan to attend this meeting, please notify us via the contact information below. Any person planning to attend who requires special access features and/or auxiliary aids, such as sign language interpreters, must inform the Commission of those needs in advance of the meeting.

Contact person for further information: John Farrell, Executive Director, U.S. Arctic Research Commission, 703–525–0111 or TDD 703–306–0090.

John Farrell, Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 2013–17846 Filed 7–24–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 1906]

Approval of Subzone Status; Easton-Bell Sports, Inc.; Rantoul, Illinois

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, the Foreign-Trade Zones Act provides for “. . . the establishment . . . of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes,” and authorizes the Foreign-Trade Zones Board to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs and Border Protection ports of entry;

Whereas, the Board’s regulations (15 CFR Part 400) provide for the establishment of subzones when existing zone facilities cannot serve the specific use involved;

Whereas, the Economic Development Council for Central Illinois, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 114, has made application to the Board for the establishment of a subzone at the facility of Easton-Bell Sports, Inc., located in Rantoul, Illinois, (FTZ Docket B–32–2013, docketed 4–16–2013);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment has been given in the Federal Register (78 FR 23904–23905, 4–23–2013) and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations;

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations are satisfied:

Now, therefore, the Board hereby approves subzone status at the facility of Easton-Bell Sports, Inc., located in Rantoul, Illinois (Subzone 114F), as described in the application and Federal Register notice, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations, including Section 400.13.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 16th day of July 2013.

Paul Piquado,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:
Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013–17904 Filed 7–24–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–831]

Fresh Garlic From the People’s Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results of Administrative Review

SUMMARY: On June 24, 2013, the United States Court of International Trade (“CIT” or “Court”) sustained the Department of Commerce’s (“Department”) final results of the third remand redetermination1 relating to the ninth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on fresh garlic from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”), pursuant to the CIT’s remand order in Taian Ziyang Food Co., Ltd. v. United States, Court No. 05–00399, Slip. Op. 13–80 (CIT 2013). 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”), as clarified by Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (“Diamond Sawblades”), the Department is notifying the public that the final CIT judgment in this case is not in harmony with the Department’s final results and is amending its final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on fresh garlic from the PRC covering the period of review (“POR”) of November 1, 2002

1 See Department of Commerce Final Remand Results of Redetermination, CIT Court No. 05–399 (January 17, 2012).