

for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 6501–6522.

Dated: May 24, 2010.

Rayne Pegg,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 2010–12833 Filed 5–27–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Information Collection; Volunteer Application for Natural Resources Agencies

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice; request for comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Forest Service is seeking comments from all interested individuals and organizations on the extension with revision of a currently approved information collection entitled, Volunteer Application for Natural Resources Agencies.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing on or before July 27, 2010 to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES: Comments concerning this notice should be addressed to Merlene Mazyck, Youth & Volunteer Programs, Forest Service, USDA, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Mailstop 1136, Washington, DC 20250–1136. Comments also may be submitted via e-mail to: mmazyck@fs.fed.us.

The public may inspect comments received at Forest Service, USDA, 1621 N. Kent Street, Rosslyn Plaza East, Room 1010, Arlington, VA during normal business hours. Visitors are encouraged to call ahead to 703–605–4831 to facilitate entry to the building.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Merlene Mazyck, Youth & Volunteer Programs, 202–205–0650. Individuals who use telecommunication devices for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Relay Service (FRS) at 1–800–877–8339, between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Standard time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Volunteer Application for Natural Resources Agencies.

OMB Number: 0596–0080.

Expiration Date of Approval: 10/31/2010.

Type of Request: Extension with Revision.

Abstract: The collected information is needed by participating natural

resources agencies to manage agency volunteer programs. Information is collected from potential and selected volunteers of all ages. Those under the age of 18 years must have written consent from a parent or guardian.

Participating Agencies

The volunteer programs of the following natural resource agencies are included:

Department of Agriculture: U.S.

Forest Service and Natural Resources Conservation Service;

Department of the Interior: National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, and U.S. Geological Survey;

Department of Defense: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers;

Department of Commerce: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Forms

OF–301 Volunteer Application: Individuals interested in volunteering may access the National Federal volunteer opportunities Web site (<http://www.volunteer.gov/gov/index.cfm>), individual agency Web sites, and/or contact agencies to request a Volunteer Application (OF–301).

Applicants provide name, address, telephone number, age, preferred work categories, available dates, preferred location, description of physical limitations, and lodging preferences. Information collected using this form assists agency volunteer coordinators and other personnel in matching volunteers with agency opportunities appropriate for an applicant's skills and physical condition and availability. Signature of a parent or guardian is mandatory for applicants under 18 years of age.

OF–301A Volunteer Agreement: This form is used by participating resource agencies to document agreements for volunteer services between a Federal agency and individual or group volunteers, including international volunteers. Signature of parent or guardian is mandatory for applicants under 18 years of age.

Forms unique to participating agencies: The forms listed below gather information necessary to reimburse volunteers for approved, miscellaneous expenses associated with volunteer assignments and record service time of volunteers.

U.S. Forest Service: FS–6500–299, Volunteers Request for Reimbursement.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: Volunteer Time Sheet; SF–1164, Claim for Miscellaneous Expenses.

U.S. Geological Survey: Form 9–2080, USGS Individual Volunteer Agreement.

National Park Service: Form 10–67, Volunteer Claim for Reimbursement.

Estimate of Annual Burden: 15 minutes.

Type of Respondents: Individuals.

Estimated Annual Number of Respondents: 400,000.

Estimated Annual Number of Responses per Respondent: 5.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 500,000 hours.

Comment is invited:

Comment is invited on: (1) Whether this collection of information is necessary for the stated purposes and the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical or scientific utility; (2) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

All comments received in response to this notice, including names and addresses when provided, will be a matter of public record. Comments will be summarized and included in the submission request toward Office of Management and Budget approval.

Dated: May 24, 2010.

William E. Timko,

Acting Deputy Chief, National Forest System.

[FR Doc. 2010–12945 Filed 5–27–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS–2010–0047]

Environmental Impact Statement; Determination of Nonregulated Status of Sugar Beet Genetically Engineered for Tolerance to the Herbicide Glyphosate

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement and proposed scope of study.

SUMMARY: We are advising the public that the Animal and Plant Health

Inspection Service plans to prepare an environmental impact statement in connection with a court-mandated evaluation of the potential impacts on the human environment associated with the Agency's determination of nonregulated status for a Monsanto/KWS SAAT AG sugar beet line, designated as event H7-1. This notice identifies the environmental and interrelated economic issues raised by the Court and other potential issues that we may include in the environmental impact statement and requests public comment to further delineate the scope of the issues and reasonable alternatives.

DATES: We will consider all comments that we receive on or before June 28, 2010.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by either of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov/fdmspublic/component/main?main=DocketDetail&d=APHIS-2010-0047> to submit or view public comments and to view supporting and related materials available electronically.

- *Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery:* Please send one copy of your comment to Docket No. APHIS-2010-0047, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3A-03.8, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737-1238. Please state that your comment refers to Docket No. APHIS-2010-0047.

Reading Room: You may read any comments that we receive on this docket in our reading room. The reading room is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 690-2817 before coming.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Andrea Huberty, Biotechnology Regulatory Services, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 147, Riverdale, MD 20737-1236; (301) 734-0485.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The regulations in 7 CFR part 340, "Introduction of Organisms and Products Altered or Produced Through Genetic Engineering Which Are Plant Pests or Which There Is Reason to Believe Are Plant Pests," regulate, among other things, the introduction (importation, interstate movement, or release into the environment) of organisms and products altered or

produced through genetic engineering that are plant pests or that there is reason to believe are plant pests. Such genetically engineered organisms and products are considered "regulated articles." The regulations in § 340.6(a) provide that any person may submit a petition to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) seeking a determination that an article should not be regulated under 7 CFR part 340. Paragraphs (b) and (c) of § 340.6 describe the form that a petition for a determination of nonregulated status must take and the information that must be included in the petition.

On October 19, 2004, APHIS published a notice in the **Federal Register** (69 FR 61466-61467, Docket No. 04-075-1) announcing receipt of a petition from Monsanto/KWS SAAT AG requesting a determination of nonregulated status under 7 CFR part 340 for sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris* ssp. *vulgaris*) designated as event H7-1, which has been genetically engineered for tolerance to the herbicide glyphosate. The petition stated that this article should not be regulated by APHIS because it does not present a plant pest risk. APHIS also announced in that notice the availability of a draft environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed determination of nonregulated status. Following review of public comments and completion of the EA, we published another notice in the **Federal Register** on March 17, 2005 (70 FR 13007-13008, Docket No. 04-075-2), advising the public of our determination, effective March 4, 2005, that the Monsanto/KWS SAAT AG sugar beet event H7-1 was no longer considered a regulated article under APHIS regulations in 7 CFR part 340.

On September 21, 2009, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California issued a ruling in a lawsuit filed by two organic seed groups and two nonprofit organizations challenging our decision to deregulate sugar beet event H7-1 (referred to in the lawsuit as Roundup Ready® sugar beet), pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Plant Protection Act. Under the provisions of NEPA, agencies must examine the potential environmental impacts of proposed Federal actions. The Court ruled that APHIS' EA failed to consider certain environmental and interrelated economic impacts. As a result, the Court stated that APHIS is required to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS). Accordingly, APHIS plans to prepare an EIS. In doing so, APHIS will utilize as appropriate any

environmental analysis provided by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other data or analysis prepared by other agencies. APHIS has requested that EPA serve as a cooperating agency. This notice identifies potential issues and reasonable alternatives that we are considering addressing, and requests public comment on the inclusion of these or related issues and alternatives in the EIS.

Management practices for organic sugar beet, conventional sugar beet, and glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet. What are the management practices and associated costs of establishing, growing, harvesting, and marketing sugar beet, including selling prices and premiums for the various types of sugar beet? What crop rotation regimes are used with sugar beet?

Production levels of organic and conventional sugar beet, Swiss chard, and table beet by region, State, and county. What is the acreage of cultivated, volunteer, or feral sugar beet? What is the acreage of Swiss chard and table beet? Which regions of the country may be affected as a result of a determination of nonregulated status for glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet? What are the potential impacts on adjacent, nonagricultural lands such as natural areas, forested lands, or transportation routes that may result from the use of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet?

Potential impacts of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet cultivation on livestock production systems. What are the potential impacts of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet cultivation on conventional and organic livestock production systems?

Potential impacts on food and feed. Does glyphosate affect the socioeconomic value of food or feed or its nutritional quality? What are the impacts, if any, on food or feed socioeconomic value or its nutritional quality from the use of glyphosate?

Differences in weediness traits of conventional sugar beet versus glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet. What are the differences, if any, in weediness traits of conventional sugar beet versus glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet under managed crop production systems, as well as in unmanaged ecosystems?

Occurrence of common and serious weeds found in organic sugar beet systems, in conventional sugar beet systems, and in glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet systems. What are the impacts of weeds, herbicide-tolerant weeds, weed management practices, and unmet weed management needs for organic and conventional sugar beet cultivation? How may the weed impacts

change with the use of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet?

Management practices for controlling weeds in organic sugar beet systems, in conventional sugar beet systems, and in glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet systems. What are the potential changes in crop rotation practices and weed management practices for control of volunteer sugar beet or herbicide-tolerant weeds in rotational crops that may occur with the use of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet? What are the potential effects on sugar beet stand termination and renovation practices that may occur with the use of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet?

Cumulative impact on the development of glyphosate-resistant weeds. What glyphosate-resistant weeds have been identified and what is their occurrence in crops and in non-crop ecosystems? How would the addition of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet impact the occurrence of glyphosate-resistant weeds in sugar beet, in other crops, and in the environment? Which are the most likely weeds, if any, to gain glyphosate resistance and why would they gain such resistance with the use of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet? What are the current and potentially effective strategies for management of glyphosate-tolerant or other herbicide-tolerant weeds in glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet stands or in subsequent crops? What are the potential changes that may occur in glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet as to susceptibility or tolerance to other herbicides?

Current or prospective herbicide-tolerant weed mitigation options. What are the potential impacts of current or prospective herbicide-tolerant weed mitigation options, including those addressed by the EPA-approved label for glyphosate herbicides?

Potential for gene flow from glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet to other Beta species, including gene flow between seed fields, root crops, and feral plants. To what extent will deregulation change hybridization between cultivated and feral sugar beet, sugar beet introgression or establishment outside of cultivated lands, and sugar beet persistence or weediness in situations where it is unwanted, unintended, or unexpected? What are the potential impacts associated with feral glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet plants? Will the removal of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet, in situations where it is unwanted, unintended, or unexpected, result in adverse impacts? In such situations, how will glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet be controlled or managed differently

from other unwanted, unintended, or unexpected sugar beet?

Economic and social impacts on organic and conventional sugar beet, Swiss chard, and table beet farmers. What are the economics of growing organic sugar beet, conventional sugar beet, or glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet as well as the economics of growing organic or conventional Swiss chard and table beet? What are the potential impacts of the presence of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet caused by pollen movement or seed admixtures? What are the potential impacts of commingling sugar beet seed with glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet seed? What are the potential changes in the economics of growing and marketing organic and conventional sugar beet that may occur with the growing of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet? What are the potential changes in production levels of other crops that may occur with the growing of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet? Will the cultivation of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet result in more or fewer acres of other crops? What are the potential changes in growing practices, management practices, and crop rotational practices in the production of sugar beet seed for planting purposes that may occur with the use of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet? What are the potential changes in the choice of seeds available for organic and conventional sugar beet farmers that may occur with the use of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet?

Cumulative impact of potential increased glyphosate usage with the cultivation of glyphosate-tolerant crops. What are the past, present, and future impacts of glyphosate usage on soil quality, water quality, air quality, weed populations, crop rotations, soil microorganisms, diseases, insects, soil fertility, food or feed quality, crop acreages, and crop yields as a result of the introduction of glyphosate-tolerant crops? Does the level of glyphosate tolerance within glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet plants have an impact on the amount of glyphosate applied on the glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet crop on a routine basis?

Impacts on threatened or endangered species. What are the potential impacts of glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet cultivation on listed threatened or endangered species, or on species proposed for listing? What are the potential impacts of glyphosate use on listed threatened or endangered species or species proposed for listing, including glyphosate used on glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet? What impacts does the addition of glyphosate tolerance in sugar beet cultivation have

on threatened and endangered species as a result of displacing other herbicides?

Potential health impacts. What are the potential health impacts to farmers or others who would be exposed to glyphosate-tolerant sugar beet?

Can any potential negative environmental impacts of the action be mitigated and what is the likelihood that such mitigation measures will be successfully implemented and effective? What is the likely effectiveness of the stewardship measures, outlined in the petition, which are designed to reduce inadvertent gene flow to negligible levels as well as to monitor and minimize the potential development of glyphosate-tolerant weeds? Are there reasonable alternative stewardship or monitoring measures that may avoid or minimize reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts of a deregulation decision?

Impacts of the mitigation measures on coexistence with organic and conventional sugar beet production and on export markets. What are the potential impacts of mitigation measures on coexistence with organic and conventional sugar beet production and on export markets? Are there reasonable alternative measures that may avoid or minimize reasonably foreseeable impacts on organic and conventional sugar beet production and on export markets that may be associated with a deregulation decision?

Consideration of reasonable alternatives. The EIS will consider a range of reasonable alternatives. These could include continued regulation of Roundup Ready® sugar beets, deregulating Roundup Ready® sugar beets, deregulating Roundup Ready® sugar beets in part with geographic restrictions, or deregulating Roundup Ready® sugar beets in part with required separation distances from sexually compatible crops. Comments that identify other reasonable alternatives that should be examined in the EIS would be especially helpful.

Sugar beet growth, crop management, and crop utilization may vary considerably by geographic region, and therefore, when providing comments on a topic or issue, please provide relevant information on the specific locality or region in question. Additionally, we invite the participation of any affected Federal, State, or local agencies or Tribes.

All comments on this notice will be carefully considered in developing the final scope of the EIS. Upon completion of the draft EIS, a notice announcing its availability and an invitation to

comment on it will be published in the **Federal Register**.

Done in Washington, DC, this 25th day of May 2010.

Kevin Shea,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2010-12997 Filed 5-26-10; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Kenai Peninsula-Anchorage Borough Resource Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Kenai Peninsula-Anchorage Borough Resource Advisory Committee will convene for their first formal meeting in Portage Valley, Alaska, for the purpose of establishing the Committee through the development of bylaws, a chairperson, and a future meeting schedule, under the provisions of Title II of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110-343).

DATES: The meeting will be held on Saturday, June 12, 2010.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will take place at the Begich Boggs Visitor's Center, 800 Portage Lake Loop, Portage, AK 99587.

Send written comments to Kenai Peninsula-Anchorage Borough Resource Advisory Committee, c/o USDA Forest Service, P.O. Box 390, Seward, AK 99664 or electronically to slatimer@fs.fed.us.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Travis Moseley, Designated Federal Official, c/o USDA Forest Service, P.O. Box 390, Seward, AK 99664, telephone (907) 288-7730.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The agenda will include background on the provisions of Title II of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110-343) and an overview of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). In addition, the agenda will include time for the Committee to develop and adopt bylaws, a chairperson, and a future meeting schedule to discuss project proposals.

All Resource Advisory Committee Meetings are open to the public. The public input and comment forum will take place in the afternoon of June 12, 2010. Interested citizens are encouraged to attend.

Dated: May 13, 2010.

Travis Moseley,

District Ranger.

[FR Doc. 2010-12714 Filed 5-27-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

ARCTIC RESEARCH COMMISSION

Notice of Meeting

May 10, 2010.

Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Arctic Research Commission will hold its 93rd meeting in Washington, DC, on June 2-3, 2010. The business session, open to the public, will convene June 3 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 92nd meeting.

(3) Commissioners and staff reports.

(4) Discussion and presentations concerning Arctic research activities.

The focus of the meeting will be reports and updates on 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 accessibility 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. 2010-12712 Filed 5-27-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-956]

Certain Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line, and Pressure Pipe from the People's Republic of China: Amended Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 28, 2010.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("Department") has determined that it made certain significant ministerial errors in the preliminary determination

of sales at less than fair value in the antidumping duty investigation of certain seamless carbon and alloy steel standard, line, and pressure pipe ("seamless pipe") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). As a result, we are amending our preliminary determination to correct certain significant ministerial errors with respect to the antidumping duty margins for a mandatory respondent and for exporters eligible for a separate rate.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Magd Zalok, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4162.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 28, 2010, the Department published its affirmative preliminary determination in this proceeding. *See Certain Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line, and Pressure Pipe From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, Affirmative Preliminary Determination of Critical Circumstances, in Part, and Postponement of Final Determination*, 75 FR 22372 (April 28, 2010) ("Preliminary Determination"). On May 3, 2010, Tianjin Pipe (Group) Corporation and Tianjin Pipe International Economic and Trading Corporation (collectively "TPCO") submitted ministerial error allegations with respect to the margin calculations for TPCO in the *Preliminary Determination*, alleging certain errors in conversion, arithmetic, and surrogate value calculations. No other interested party submitted ministerial error allegations. After reviewing TPCO's allegations, we have determined that the *Preliminary Determination* contains ministerial errors. We agree that the ministerial errors are "significant" as that term is defined in 19 CFR 351.224(g). Therefore, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(e), we have made changes to the *Preliminary Determination*.

Scope of Investigation

The merchandise covered by this investigation is certain seamless carbon and alloy steel (other than stainless steel) pipes and redraw hollows, less than or equal to 16 inches (406.4 mm) in outside diameter, regardless of wall-thickness, manufacturing process (e.g., hot-finished or cold-drawn), end finish (e.g., plain end, beveled end, upset end, threaded, or threaded and coupled), or surface finish (e.g., bare, lacquered or coated). Redraw hollows are any unfinished carbon or alloy steel (other