

Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department conducted expedited (120-day) sunset reviews of the AD *Orders* on CTL plate from India, Indonesia, and Korea.

Scope of the Orders

The products covered under the *Orders* are certain hot-rolled carbon-quality steel: (1) Universal mill plates (*i.e.*, flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 mm but not exceeding 1250 mm, and of a nominal or actual thickness of not less than 4 mm, which are cut-to-length (not in coils) and without patterns in relief), of iron or non-alloy-quality steel; and (2) flat-rolled products, hot-rolled, of a nominal or actual thickness of 4.75 mm or more and of a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness, and which are cut-to-length (not in coils). Steel products to be included in the scope of the *Orders* are of rectangular, square, circular or other shape and of rectangular or non-rectangular cross-section where such non-rectangular cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been “worked after rolling”)—for example, products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges. Steel products that meet the noted physical characteristics that are painted, varnished or coated with plastic or other non-metallic substances are included within the scope. Also, specifically included in the scope of the *Orders* are high strength, low alloy (HSLA) steels. HSLA steels are recognized as steels with micro-alloying levels of elements such as chromium, copper, niobium, titanium, vanadium, and molybdenum.

The merchandise subject to the *Orders* is currently classifiable in the HTSUS under subheadings: 7208.40.3030, 7208.40.3060, 7208.51.0030, 7208.51.0045, 7208.51.0060, 7208.52.0000, 7208.53.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.13.0000, 7211.14.0030, 7211.14.0045, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000, 7225.40.3050, 7225.40.7000, 7225.50.6000, 7225.99.0090, 7226.91.5000, 7226.91.7000, 7226.91.8000, 7226.99.0000. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise covered by the *Orders* is dispositive.

The Issues and Decision Memorandum, which is hereby adopted

by this notice, provides a full description of the scope of the *Orders*.⁵

Analysis of Comments Received

A complete discussion of all issues raised in these reviews is provided in the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum. The issues discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin of dumping that is likely to prevail if the *Orders* were revoked. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://access.trade.gov> and to all parties in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/>. The signed Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Reviews

Pursuant to sections 751(c)(1) and 752(c)(1) and (3) of the Act, the Department determines that revocation of the AD *Orders* on CTL plate from India, Indonesia, and Korea would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, and that the magnitude of the margin of dumping that is likely to prevail would be at rates up to 42.39 percent for India, up to 52.42 percentage for Indonesia, and up to 4.64 percent for Korea.

Administrative Protective Orders

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

⁵ See the Department’s memorandum from Gary Taverman, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Expedited Third Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders on Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate from India, Indonesia, and the Republic of Korea,” dated concurrently with this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

Notification to Interested Parties

We are issuing and publishing the results of the reviews and this notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4).

Dated: March 31, 2017.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2017–08174 Filed 4–21–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–122–854]

Supercalendered Paper From Canada: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Expedited Review

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) has conducted an expedited review of the countervailing duty (CVD) order on supercalendered paper (SC paper) from Canada. The period of review (POR) for which we are measuring subsidies is January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2014. We determine that Irving Paper Limited received countervailable subsidies during the POR and that Catalyst received *de minimis* countervailable subsidies. As a result of this determination, we are excluding Catalyst from the countervailing duty order on SC paper from Canada.

DATES: Effective April 24, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Toby Vandall or Peter Zukowski, AD/CVD Operations, Office I, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1664 and (202) 482–0189, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published the *Preliminary Results* of the expedited review on November 28, 2016.¹ A summary of the events that occurred since the Department published the *Preliminary Results*, as well as a full

¹ See *Supercalendered Paper From Canada: Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Expedited Review*, 81 FR 85520 (November 28, 2016) (*Preliminary Results*).

discussion of the issues raised by parties for the final results, may be found in the Issues and Decision Memorandum² issued concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://access.trade.gov>, and is available to all parties in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/>. The signed Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic version are identical in content.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by this order is SC paper from Canada. A full description of the scope of the order is contained in the Issues and Decision Memorandum.³

Methodology

The Department has conducted this CVD expedited review in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(k). For a full description of the methodology underlying our conclusions, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum. The subsidy programs under review, and the issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs submitted by the parties, are discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum. A list of the issues that parties raised, and to which we responded in the Issues and Decision Memorandum, is attached to this notice at the Appendix.

Based on our review and analysis of the comments received from parties, we made certain changes to Catalyst's and Irving's subsidy rate calculations since the *Preliminary Results*. For a discussion of these changes, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum and the Final Calculation Memoranda.⁴

We calculated a CVD rate for each producer/exporter of the subject merchandise that requested an expedited review.

² See Department Memorandum, "Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of Expedited Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Supercalendered Paper from Canada" (dated concurrently with this notice).

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*; see also Department Memorandum, "Final Results Calculations for Catalyst Paper" (April 17, 2017); see also Department Memorandum, "Final Results Calculations for Irving Paper Limited" (April 17, 2017).

Final Results of the Expedited Review

As a result of this expedited review, we determine the countervailable subsidy rates to be:

Company	Subsidy rate
Catalyst Paper Corporation (Catalyst).	0.94 percent (<i>de minimis</i>).
Irving Paper Limited (Irving) ..	5.87 percent.

Cash Deposit Instructions

Pursuant to section 19 CFR 351.214(k)(3)(iii), the final results of this expedited review will not be the basis for the assessment of countervailing duties. Upon the issuance of these final results, the Department will instruct Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties for the companies subject to this expedited review, at the rates shown above, on shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this expedited review. These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(k)(3)(iv), because we have determined a countervailable subsidy rate for Catalyst that is *de minimis*, with these final results of expedited review, we determine to exclude Catalyst from the countervailing duty order. The Department's practice with respect to exclusions of companies from a countervailing duty order is to exclude the subject merchandise both produced and exported by those companies.⁵ As a result, we will instruct CBP to discontinue the suspension of liquidation and the collection of cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties on all shipments of SC paper produced and exported by Catalyst, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of these final results. In addition, we will instruct CBP to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, all suspended entries of shipments of SC paper produced and exported by Catalyst, and to refund all cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties collected on all such shipments. Merchandise which Catalyst exports but does not produce, as well as merchandise Catalyst produces but is exported by another

⁵ See, e.g. *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products from India, Italy, Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China: Countervailing Duty Order*, 81 FR 48387 (July 25, 2016).

company, remains subject to the countervailing duty order.

Administrative Protective Orders

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(k).

Dated: April 17, 2017.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix

List of Topics Discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum

- I. Summary
- II. Background
- III. Scope of the Order
- IV. Subsidies Valuation
- V. Analysis of Programs
- VI. Analysis of Comments
 - Comment 1: The Correct *de minimis* Rate in an Expedited Review
 - Comment 2: Whether To Exclude or Revoke Catalyst from the Order
 - Comment 3: Whether the Powell River City Revitalization Area Tax Exemption Program Provided a Financial Contribution to Catalyst
 - Comment 4: Whether To Recognize the Change in Catalyst's Property Values in Calculating the Benefit of the Powell River City Revitalization Area Tax Exemption Program
 - Comment 5: Whether To Use 2007–2009 or 2009 Alone To Measure the Benefit for the Powell River City Revitalization Area Tax Exemption Program
 - Comment 6: Whether To Consider Catalyst's Former Properties as an Offset to the Benefit of the Powell River City Revitalization Area Tax Exemption Program
 - Comment 7: Whether To Consider Catalyst's One-Third Interest in the PRSC Limited Partnership in the Benefit Calculation of the Powell River City Revitalization Area Tax Exemption Program
 - Comment 8: Whether BC Hydro's Power Smart Industrial Energy Manager Program Is *De Jure* or *De Facto* Specific
 - Comment 9: Whether the Thermo-Mechanical Pulp (TMP) Subprogram of the BC Hydro Power Smart Program Is a Recurring Program
 - Comment 10: Whether the Department Should Revise its Nonrecurring Subsidy Benefit Calculation of the BC Hydro Power Smart TMP Subprogram

Comment 11: Whether the British Columbia (BC) Ban on Exports of Logs and Wood Residue Is a Countervailable Subsidy

Comment 12: Whether the BC Ban on Exports of Logs and Wood Residue Provides a Financial Contribution

Comment 13: Whether the Department Should Use Tier 1 Benchmarks in BC

Comment 14: Whether the Department Failed To Apply Its Own Evidentiary Standards on the BC Ban on Exports of Logs and Wood Residue

Comment 15: Whether the Department Needs To Conduct a Feedback Effect Analysis

Comment 16: Whether the Department Should Use a Transaction-By-Transaction Calculation Methodology for the BC Ban on Exports of Logs and Wood Residue

Comment 17: Whether the Department Should Revise the Transportation Cost for Logs Purchased in BC by Catalyst

Comment 18: Whether the Department Selected the Appropriate Log Benchmarks

Comment 19: Whether the Wood Chip Benchmark Dataset Is Distortive

Comment 20: Whether the Department Should Revise the Wood Chip Benchmark Transportation Cost

Comment 21: Whether the Department Should Revise the Transportation Cost Applied to Catalyst's Purchases of Wood Chips in BC

Comment 22: Whether the Department Should Adjust the Sawdust and Hog Fuel Calculations Based Upon Changes to the Wood Chip Benchmark

Comment 23: Whether the Government of New Brunswick Provided Stumpage to Irving for LTAR

Comment 24: Whether the Department Should Grant an Adjustment to New Brunswick (NB) Stumpage Rates

Comment 25: Whether the Department Should Use a Transaction-By-Transaction Calculation Methodology for NB Stumpage

Comment 26: Whether the Department Should Zero Comparisons That Generate Negative Benefits

Comment 27: Whether the Large Industrial Renewable Energy Purchase Program (LIREPP) Confers a Benefit on the Irving Companies

Comment 28: The Workforce Expansion Program Is Not Specific

Comment 29: The New Brunswick R&D Tax Credit Is Not Specific

Comment 30: Whether the Benefit to JDIL From the Federal Pulp and Paper Green Transformation Program (FPPGTP) Is Countervailable

Comment 31: Whether the GNB's Reimbursement of Silviculture and License Management Expenses Is Countervailable

Comment 32: Whether the Accelerated Capital Cost Allowance (ACCA) for Class 29 Assets Is Specific and Whether It Is a Tax Credit

Comment 33: Whether the Benefit Calculation for the Atlantic Investment Tax Credit (AITC) Must Be Adjusted for

the Additional Taxes That Were Paid as a Result of the Program

Comment 34: Sales Denominators for Benefits Received by Cross-Owned Input Suppliers Must Include All Sales of the Downstream Product

VII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2017-08211 Filed 4-21-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Title: Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Voluntary Release Reports.

OMB Control Number: 0648-0628.

Form Number(s): None.

Type of Request: Regular (extension of a currently approved information collection).

Number of Respondents: 7.

Average Hours per Response: 5

minutes.

Burden Hours: 1 hour (rounded up).

Needs and Uses: This request is for an extension of a currently approved information collection.

Under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFMCA, 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*) the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is to ensure that conservation and management measures promote, to the extent practicable, implementation of scientific research programs that include the tagging and releasing of Atlantic highly migratory species (HMS). The currently approved information collection allows the public to submit volunteered geographic and biological information relating to HMS releases in order to populate an interactive Web site mapping tool. This Web page attracts visitors who are interested in Atlantic HMS and contains information and links to promote HMS tagging programs that the general public can support or become involved with. All submissions are voluntary. Information is used to raise awareness for releasing Atlantic HMS and HMS tagging programs, and is not used as representative results.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; businesses or other for-

profit organizations; not-for-profit institutions; Federal government; and State, Local, or Tribal government.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

This information collection request may be viewed at reginfo.gov. Follow the instructions to view Department of Commerce collections currently under review by OMB.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov or fax to (202) 395-5806.

Dated: April 18, 2017.

Sarah Brabson,

NOAA PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2017-08158 Filed 4-21-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Fees for Reviews of the Rule Enforcement Programs of Designated Contract Markets and Registered Futures Associations

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice of 2016 schedule of fees.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC" or "Commission") charges fees to designated contract markets and registered futures associations to recover the costs incurred by the Commission in the operation of its program of oversight of self-regulatory organization rule enforcement programs, specifically National Futures Association ("NFA"), a registered futures association, and the designated contract markets. The calculation of the fee amounts charged for 2016 by this notice is based upon an average of actual program costs incurred during fiscal year ("FY") 2013, FY 2014, and FY 2015.

DATES: *Effective:* Each self-regulatory organization is required to remit electronically the applicable fee on or before June 23, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Jean Buhler, Chief Financial Officer, Commodity Futures Trading Commission; (202) 418-5089; Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW., Washington, DC 20581. For information on electronic payment, contact Jennifer Fleming; (202) 418-5034; Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW., Washington, DC 20581.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: