

provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and its implementing regulations at 5 CFR part 1320 do not apply.

Dated: December 5, 2005.

Dale N. Bosworth,
Chief.

Text of Proposed Directive

Note: The Forest Service organizes its directive system by alpha-numeric codes and subject headings. Only the section of the FSH 1909.15, Environmental Policy and Procedures Handbook, affected by this proposed directive is included in this notice. Please note, however, that category 15 (para. 16) is reserved. A notice for comment was published for category 16 on January 5, 2005 (70 FR 1062). A final directive for this CE has not been adopted as of the date of publication of this **Federal Register** notice. The complete text of FSH 1909.15, Chapter 30 may be obtained by contacting the individuals listed in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** or from the Forest Service home page on the World Wide Web at <http://www.fs.fed.us/im/directives/fsh/1909.15/1909.15.30.txt>. The intended audience for this direction is Forest Service employees charged with planning and administering oil and gas exploration and development projects on NFS lands under Federal lease.

FSH 1909.15—Environmental Policy and Procedures Handbook Chapter 30—Categorical Exclusion from Documentation

Add new paragraphs 16 and 17 as follows:

31.2—Categories of Action for Which a Project or Case File and Decision Memo Are Required

Routine, proposed actions within any of the following categories may be excluded from documentation in an EIS or an EA; however, a project or case file is required and the decision to proceed must be documented in a decision memo (sec. 32). As a minimum, the project or case file should include any records prepared, such as: The names of interested and affected people, groups, and agencies contacted; the determination that no extraordinary circumstances exist; a copy of the decision memo (sec. 05); and a list of the people notified of the decision. Maintain a project or case file and prepare a decision memo for any of the categories of actions set forth in section 21.21 through 31.23.

* * * * *

16. [Reserved]

17. Approval of a Surface Use Plan of Operations for oil and natural gas exploration or development activities within a new oil and/or gas field, so long as the approval will not authorize

activities in excess of any of the following:

- a. One mile of new road construction
- b. One mile of road reconstruction
- c. Three miles of pipeline installation
- d. Four drill sites.

[FR Doc. 05-23983 Filed 12-12-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-P

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SES Performance Review Board

AGENCY: American Battle Monuments Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the appointment of members of the ABMC Performance Review Board.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Theodore Gloukhoff, Director of Personnel and Administration, American Battle Monuments Commission, Courthouse Plaza II, Suite 500, 2300 Clarendon Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia, 22201-3367, Telephone Number: (703) 696-6908. American Battle Monuments Commission SES Performance Review Board Mr. Gerald W. Barnes, Chief, Operations Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Mr. Donald L. Basham, Chief, Engineering & Construction, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Mr. Stephen Coakley, Director of Resource Management, US Army Corps of Engineers

Theodore Gloukhoff,

Director, Personnel and Administration.

[FR Doc. E5-7257 Filed 12-12-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6120-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A-533-810

Stainless Steel Bar from India: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony and Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation

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

SUMMARY: On October 20, 2005, in *Slater Steels Corp. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 02-00551, Slip Op. 05-137 (CIT October 20, 2005) (“*Slater III*”), a lawsuit challenging the Department of Commerce’s (“the Department”) *Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative*

Review: Stainless Steel Bar from India, 67 FR 53336 (August 15, 2002) (“*Final Results*”) and the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (July 5, 2002) (“*Decision Memorandum*”), the Court of International Trade (“CIT”) affirmed the Department’s third remand determination and entered a judgment order. In the remand determination, the Department did not collapse Viraj Alloys Limited (“VAL”) with Viraj Impoexpo Limited (“VIL”) and Viraj Forgings Limited (“VFL”). The Department calculated an individual antidumping duty margin for VIL/VFL. The Department did not calculate an individual antidumping duty margin for VAL because it did not export the subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review. The resulting antidumping duty margin for VIL/VFL is 0.84 percent.

Consistent with the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (“Federal Circuit”) in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (“*Timken*”), the Department will continue to order the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise until there is a “conclusive” decision in this case. If the case is not appealed, or if it is affirmed on appeal, the Department will instruct the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) to liquidate all relevant entries of subject merchandise for VIL/VFL.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 30, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Williams, AD/CVD Enforcement Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4619.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In the underlying administrative review covering the period February 1, 2000, though January 31, 2001, the Department collapsed VAL, VIL, and VFL pursuant to 19 USC § 1677(33) and 19 CFR § 351.401(f) (2000). *See Final Results; see also Decision Memorandum* at Comment 1. As a collapsed entity, VAL/VIL/VFL received a *de minimis* dumping margin.

Based upon the record evidence, the Department found that VAL, VIL, and VFL “meet the regulations’ collapsing requirements.” *Decision Memorandum* at Comment 1. First, the Department found that “VAL and VIL can produce subject merchandise (*i.e.*, similar or identical products) and can continue to do so, independently or under existing leasing agreements, without substantial