under the plan, and to consider whether there is a need to adjust the plan. One challenge the Agency has faced with regard to public participation is that plans can at times take 8–10 years to revise, a timeframe that is too long to sustain a true collaborative effort and use the most up-to-date science and management thinking.

Specific questions we would like the public to address include:

• How could the Agency foster collaborative efforts? What kinds of participation, forums for collaboration, and methods of providing input have you found most engaging?

• What should the rule require to ensure a planning process that is both efficient and transparent while allowing for full public collaboration and participation within a reasonable timeframe?

• What kinds of information, methods, and analyses should the Agency provide to the public during the planning process to aid understanding of the possible consequences of a proposed rule and alternatives?

• What kind of administrative review process should be offered to the public in the planning rule? Should there be a pre-decisional objection or a post-decisional appeal process?

2. Plans could incorporate an ''all-lands'' approach by considering the relationship between NFS lands and neighboring lands. The threats and opportunities facing our lands and natural resources do not stop at ownership boundaries. Healthy forests and grasslands are elements of integrated landscapes that need to be restored, conserved and managed across geographical and organizational boundaries in ways that respect private rights and multiple ownerships. The land management planning process provides direction for NFS lands only. However, the planning process provides an opportunity for the Agency to engage other Federal land management agencies; Tribes, State, and local land managers; private landowners; and non-governmental partners to collaborate on strategies to restore and sustain healthy forests and grasslands across landscapes. Incorporating an all-lands approach in the planning process is also important as land management plans anticipate the effects of broad challenges such as climate change which can cause impacts on a regional scale.

Specific questions we would like the public to address include:

• How should the planning rule account for the relationship of NFS lands to surrounding landscapes?

• What other planning and assessment efforts or processes at the national, state or local level should the Agency look at that could inform an ''all-lands'' approach?

3. Plans could be based on the latest planning science and principles to achieve the best decisions possible. The new planning rule could encourage the creation of a shared vision of the planning area. Developing this through a strong collaborative public process could create a common understanding of the goals and direction for each plan, and will frame management actions and projects on the ground as a plan is implemented. Creating a plan that reflects a clear description of the shared *vision* and the desired conditions of a planning area, a *strategy* for moving toward the vision; and *design criteria,* including standards and guidelines that would apply to project and activity decisions, might be one way to move toward achieving the vision.

Specific questions we would like the public to address include:

• How can the planning rule support the creation of a shared vision for each planning area through the planning process?

• Local and regional differences will have an impact on desired conditions and on the successful creation and implementation of a shared vision for any given planning area. Given that different areas will have different needs, should the planning rule allow a choice of planning processes? How could the planning rule create different process choices, and how could they be presented in the rule? What kinds of provisions would need to be included to guide and evaluate a process choice?

• Much discussion has been centered on how land management plans should be viewed; are they strategic documents that lay the foundation for specific future actions to help meet unit goals? Or, should land management plans also make project or activity decisions?

• Based on your response to the question above, what is the range of options for fully complying with NEPA during land management plan development, amendment, or revision?

• Should the new planning rule require standards and guidelines that are required for all plans?

• How can the agency analyze and describe the environmental effects of a planning rule in the environmental impact statement?

Possible Alternatives

The Agency will identify a proposed action and a no-action alternative as it develops an EIS. Additional alternatives have not been identified, but will be developed based on the comments that are received. The Agency will frame issues and alternatives during the scoping and public comment periods in the NEPA process.

Responsible Official

The responsible official is the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, USDA, 1400 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20250.

Nature of Decision To Be Made

The responsible official will issue a land management planning rule.

Dated: December 14, 2009.

Harris D. Sherman,

Under Secretary, NRE.

[FR Doc. E9–30174 Filed 12–17–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of call for nominations 2010.

SUMMARY: The National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council, (NUCFAC) will be filling four positions that will be expiring at the end of December 2009, and one interim term position. Interested applicants may download a copy of the application and position descriptions from the U.S. Forest Service's Urban and Community Forestry Web site: *http://www.fs.fed.us/ucf/.*

DATES: Nomination(s) must be ''received'' (not postmarked) by January 29, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Nomination applications sent by courier should be addressed to: Nancy Stremple, Executive Staff to National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Yates Building (1 Central) MS–1151, Washington, DC 20250–1151. Please submit electronic nomination(s) to: *nucfac_ucf_proposals@fs.fed.us.* The subject line should read: 2010 NUCFAC Nominations.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Stremple, Executive Staff or Mary Dempsey, Staff Assistant to National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Yates Building (1 Central) MS–1151, Washington, DC 20250–1151, phone 202–205–1054.

Individuals who use telecommunication devices for the deaf

(TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Facsimiles will not be accepted as official nominations. E-mail or a courier service is recommended. Regular mail submissions must be screened by the Agency and may delay the receipt of the application up to a month.

A total of five positions will be filled. The following four positions will serve 3-year term appointments from January 1, 2010, to December 31, 2012. Positions to be filled are for:

- A member who is not currently an officer or employee of any government body living in a city with a population of less than 50,000 and who has experience and has been active in urban and community forestry.
- A member representing city/town government.
- One of two members representing a national non-profit forestry and/or conservation citizen organization.
- One of two members representing academic institutions with an expertise in urban and community forestry activities.

The fifth position will fill an interim term appointment (January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2010):

- A person representing forest products, nursery, or related industries.

Dated: December 9, 2009.

Robin L. Thompson,

Associate Deputy Chief, State and Private.

[FR Doc. E9–30113 Filed 12–17–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–337–804, A–533–813, A–560–802, A–570–851

Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Chile, India, Indonesia and the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders

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

SUMMARY: On October 1, 2009, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on certain preserved mushrooms from Chile, India, Indonesia, and the People's Republic of China (PRC), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). The Department has conducted expedited (120-day) sunset reviews for these orders pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2). As a result of these sunset reviews, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Goldberger or Kate Johnson, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4136 and (202) 482–4929, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 2, 1998, the Department published the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from Chile. *See Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Chile*, 63 FR 66529 (December 2, 1998). On February 19, 1999, the Department published the antidumping duty orders on certain preserved mushrooms from India, Indonesia, and the PRC. *See Notice of Amendment of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Preserved Mushrooms from India, 64 FR 8311 (February 19, 1999); Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Indonesia*, 64 FR 8310 (February 19, 1999); and *Notice of Amendment of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Preserved Mushrooms from the People's Republic of China*, 64 FR 8308 (February 19, 1999).

In 2003–2004, the Department conducted the first sunset review on imports of certain preserved mushrooms from Chile, India, Indonesia, and the PRC, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, and found that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the same rates as found in the original investigations.[1] In November 2004, the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of these antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.[2] Also in November 2004, the Department published a notice of continuation of these antidumping duty orders.[3]

On October 1, 2009, the Department published the notice of initiation of the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on certain preserved mushrooms from Chile, India, Indonesia, and the PRC, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. *See Initiation of Five-year (''Sunset'') Reviews*, 74 FR 50776 (October 1, 2009) (*Notice of Initiation*).

The Department received a notice of intent to participate from the Coalition for Fair Preserved Mushroom Trade (the ''Coalition''), a domestic interested party, which is comprised of L.K. Bowman Company, a division of Hanover Foods Corporation, Monterey Mushrooms, Inc., The Mushroom Company (formerly Mushroom Canning Company), and Sunny Dell Foods, Inc., within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i). The Coalition claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act as a manufacturer of a domestic like product in the United States.

The Department received a complete substantive response to the notice of initiation from the domestic interested party within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). We received no substantive responses from respondent interested parties with respect to any of the orders covered by these sunset reviews, nor was a hearing requested. As a result, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department conducted expedited (120-day) sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on certain preserved mushrooms from Chile, India, Indonesia, and the PRC.

Scope of the Orders

The products covered under the Certain Preserved Mushrooms orders are imported whole, sliced, diced, or as stems and pieces. The ''preserved mushrooms'' covered under the orders are the species *Agaricus bisporus* and *Agaricus bitorquis*. ''Preserved mushrooms'' refer to mushrooms that have been prepared or preserved by cleaning, blanching, and sometimes slicing or cutting. These mushrooms are then packed and heated in containers, including but not limited to cans or glass jars in a suitable liquid medium, including but not limited to water,

[1] *See Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Chile, India, Indonesia and the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews of Antidumping Duty Orders*, 69 FR 11384 (March 10, 2004).

[2] *See Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Chile, China, India, and Indonesia*, 69 FR 63408 (November 1, 2004).

[3] *See Continuation of Antidumping Duty Orders on Certain Preserved Mushrooms form Chile, the People's Republic of China, India, and Indonesia*, 69 FR 67308 (November 17, 2004).