applicants to utilize the DS–1950 this year. Although we are encouraging all programs to use USAJobs.gov, we wish to extend the form to ensure we are not in violation under the Paper Reduction Act (PRA) during the transitioning period. Data, which is extracted from the form, is necessary to determine qualifications, salary, and selections, in accordance with Federal policies.

Dated: March 25, 2014.

**William E. Schaal, Jr.,**

*Executive Director, HR/EX, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 2014–07859 Filed 4–7–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710–05–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

**[Public Notice 8686]**

### Culturally Significant Objects Imported for Exhibition Determinations: ''Spanish Drawings From the Kunsthalle of Hamburg, Germany''

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given of the following determinations: Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Act of October 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 985; 22 U.S.C. 2459), Executive Order 12047 of March 27, 1978, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2681, *et seq.;* 22 U.S.C. 6501 note, *et seq.*), Delegation of Authority No. 234 of October 1, 1999, and Delegation of Authority No. 236–3 of August 28, 2000 (and, as appropriate, Delegation of Authority No. 257 of April 15, 2003), I hereby determine that the objects to be included in the exhibition ''Spanish Drawings from the Kunsthalle of Hamburg, Germany,'' imported from abroad for temporary exhibition within the United States, are of cultural significance. The objects are imported pursuant to a loan agreement with the foreign owner or custodian. I also determine that the exhibition or display of the exhibit objects at the Meadows Museum, Dallas, Texas, from on or about May 25, 2014, until on or about August 31, 2014, and at possible additional exhibitions or venues yet to be determined, is in the national interest. I have ordered that Public Notice of these Determinations be published in the **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information, including a list of the imported objects, contact Paul W. Manning, Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser, U.S. Department of State (telephone: 202–632–6469). The mailing address is U.S. Department of State, SA–5, L/PD, Fifth Floor (Suite 5H03), Washington, DC 20522–0505.

Dated: April 1, 2014.

**Kelly Keiderling,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 2014–07851 Filed 4–7–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710–05–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

**[Public Notice 8685]**

### Culturally Significant Object Imported for Exhibition Determinations: ''Unity of Nature: Alexander von Humboldt and the Americas''

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given of the following determinations: Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Act of October 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 985; 22 U.S.C. 2459), Executive Order 12047 of March 27, 1978, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2681, *et seq.;* 22 U.S.C. 6501 note, *et seq.*), Delegation of Authority No. 234 of October 1, 1999, and Delegation of Authority No. 236–3 of August 28, 2000 (and, as appropriate, Delegation of Authority No. 257 of April 15, 2003), I hereby determine that the object to be included in the exhibition ''Unity of Nature: Alexander von Humboldt and the Americas,'' imported from abroad for temporary exhibition within the United States, are of cultural significance. The object is imported pursuant to a loan agreement with the foreign owner or custodian. I also determine that the exhibition or display of the exhibit object at the Americas Society, New York, New York, from on or about April 29, 2014, until on or about July 26, 2014, and at possible additional exhibitions or venues yet to be determined, is in the national interest. I have ordered that Public Notice of these Determinations be published in the **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information, including a description of the imported object, contact Paul W. Manning, Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser, U.S. Department of State (telephone: 202–632–6469). The mailing address is U.S. Department of State, SA–5, L/PD, Fifth Floor (Suite 5H03), Washington, DC 20522–0505.

Dated: April 1, 2014.

**Kelly Keiderling,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 2014–07853 Filed 4–7–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710–05–P**

## OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

**[Dispute No. WTO/DS471]**

### WTO Dispute Settlement Proceeding Regarding Certain Methodologies and Their Application to Anti-Dumping Proceedings Involving China

**AGENCY:** Office of the United States Trade Representative.

**ACTION:** Notice; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of the United States Trade Representative (''USTR'') is providing notice that the People's Republic of China (''China'') has requested the establishment of a dispute settlement panel under the *Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization* (''WTO Agreement''). That request may be found at *www.wto.org* contained in a document designated as WT/DS471/5. USTR invites written comments from the public concerning the issues raised in this dispute.

**DATES:** Although USTR will accept any comments received during the course of the dispute settlement proceedings, comments should be submitted on or before May 2, 2014, to be assured of timely consideration by USTR.

**ADDRESSES:** Public comments should be submitted electronically to *www.regulations.gov,* docket number USTR–2014–0001. If you are unable to provide submissions by *www.regulations.gov,* please contact Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395–9483 to arrange for an alternative method of transmission.

If (as explained below) the comment contains confidential information, then the comment should be submitted by fax only to Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395–3640.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** J. Daniel Stirk, Associate General Counsel, or Mayur Patel, Assistant General Counsel, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20508, (202) 395–3150.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In accordance with Section 127(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA'') (19 U.S.C. 3537(b)(1)), USTR is providing notice that a dispute settlement panel has been established pursuant to the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding (''DSU''). The panel will hold its meetings in Geneva, Switzerland.

#### Major Issues Raised by China

In its request for the establishment of a panel, China alleges that the Department of Commerce (''Commerce'')

acted inconsistently with various U.S. WTO obligations in a number of U.S. antidumping proceedings. The proceedings concern a number of imported products from China, including certain coated paper suitable for high-quality print graphics using sheet-fed presses (coated paper), certain oil country tubular goods (OCTG), high pressure steel cylinders (steel cylinders), polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip (PET film), aluminum extrusions, certain frozen and canned warmwater shrimp (shrimp), certain new pneumatic off-the-road tires (tires), crystalline silicon photovoltaic cells, whether or not assembled into modules (solar cells), diamond sawblades and parts thereof (sawblades), multilayered wood flooring (flooring), narrow woven ribbons with woven selvedge (ribbons), polyethylene retail carrier bags (bags), and wooden bedroom furniture (furniture).

With respect to the antidumping measures on coated paper, OCTG, and steel cylinders, China challenges the application by Commerce in investigations of what China describes as a ''targeted dumping methodology'' and the use of ''zeroing'' in connection with the application of such methodology. China's challenge purports to include Commerce's final determinations in the antidumping investigations of these products, any modification, replacement, or amendment of such final determinations, and ''any closely connected, subsequent measures'' that involve the ''targeted dumping methodology.'' China is asserting that the application of the ''targeted dumping methodology'' is inconsistent with U.S. obligations under Article 2.4 of the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (AD Agreement).

With respect to the antidumping measure on PET film, China challenges Commerce's application in an administrative review of what China describes as a ''targeted dumping methodology'' and the use of ''zeroing'' in connection with the application of such methodology. China's challenge purports to include Commerce's final determination in the antidumping duty administrative review of PET film, any modification, replacement, or amendment of such final determination, and ''any closely connected, subsequent measures'' that involve the ''targeted dumping methodology.'' China is asserting that the use of the ''targeted dumping methodology'' in the review is inconsistent with U.S. obligations under Article 9.3 of the AD Agreement and Article VI:2 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994.

With respect to the antidumping measures on aluminum extrusions, coated paper, shrimp, tires, OCTG, solar cells, sawblades, steel cylinders, wood flooring, ribbons, bags, PET film, and furniture, China challenges Commerce's application in investigations and administrative reviews of what China describes as a ''single rate presumption for non-market economies.'' China's challenge purports to include certain of Commerce's preliminary determinations and final determinations, any modification, replacement, or amendment of such final determinations, and ''any closely connected, subsequent measures'' that involve the application of the ''single rate presumption.'' China also challenges what China describes as the ''single rate presumption'' ''as such,'' and alleges that it has been consistently applied pursuant to the regulation set forth in 19 CFR 351.107(d), Import Administration Policy Bulletin Number 05.1 of 5 April 2005, and the Import Administration Antidumping Manual, 2009, Chapter 10. China is asserting its claims with respect to the ''single rate presumption for non-market economies'' under Articles 6.10, 9.2, and 9.4 of the AD Agreement.

With respect to the antidumping measures on aluminum extrusions, coated paper, shrimp, tires, OCTG, solar cells, sawblades, steel cylinders, wood flooring, ribbons, bags, PET film, and furniture, China challenges Commerce's application in investigations and administrative reviews of what China describes as a ''NME-wide methodology,'' which, according to China, includes as ''features'' the ''failure to request information,'' the ''failure to provide rights of defense,'' and the ''recourse to facts available.'' China's challenge purports to include certain of Commerce's preliminary determinations and final determinations, any modification, replacement, or amendment of such final determinations, and ''any closely connected, subsequent measures'' that involve the application of the ''NME-wide methodology.'' China is asserting its claims with respect to the ''NME-wide methodology'' under Articles 6.1, 6.8 and Annex II, and Article 9.4 of the AD Agreement.

Finally, with respect to the antidumping measures on aluminum extrusions, coated paper, shrimp, tires, OCTG, solar cells, sawblades, steel cylinders, wood flooring, ribbons, bags, PET film, and furniture, China challenges Commerce's application in investigations and administrative reviews of what China describes as ''adverse facts available.'' China's challenge purports to include certain of Commerce's preliminary determinations and final determinations, any modification, replacement, or amendment of such final determinations, and ''any closely connected, subsequent measures'' that involve the application of what China describes as the ''NME-wide methodology.'' China also challenges the use of what China describes as ''adverse facts available'' ''as such,'' and alleges that it has been consistently applied pursuant to section 776(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, codified at 19 U.S.C. 1677e(b) and regulations set forth in 19 CFR 351.308. China is asserting its claims with respect to ''adverse facts available'' under Article 6.8 and Annex II of the AD Agreement.

**Public Comment: Requirements for Submissions**

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning the issues raised in this dispute. Persons may submit public comments electronically to *www.regulations.gov* docket number USTR–2014–0001. If you are unable to provide submissions by *www.regulations.gov,* please contact Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395–9483 to arrange for an alternative method of transmission.

To submit comments via *www.regulations.gov,* enter docket number USTR–2014–0001 on the home page and click ''search''. The site will provide a search-results page listing all documents associated with this docket. Find a reference to this notice by selecting ''Notice'' under ''Document Type'' on the left side of the search-results page, and click on the link entitled ''Comment Now!'' (For further information on using the *www.regulations.gov* Web site, please consult the resources provided on the Web site by clicking on ''How to Use This Site'' on the left side of the home page.)

The *www.regulations.gov* Web site allows users to provide comments by filling in a ''Type Comments'' field, or by attaching a document using an ''Upload File'' field. It is expected that most comments will be provided in an attached document. If a document is attached, it is sufficient to type ''See attached'' in the ''Type Comments'' field.

A person requesting that information contained in a comment that he/she submitted, be treated as confidential business information must certify that such information is business confidential and would not customarily

be released to the public by the submitter. Confidential business information must be clearly designated as such and the submission must be marked ''BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL'' at the top and bottom of the cover page and each succeeding page. Any comment containing business confidential information must be submitted by fax to Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395–3640. A non-confidential summary of the confidential information must be submitted to *www.regulations.gov*. The non-confidential summary will be placed in the docket and will be open to public inspection.

USTR may determine that information or advice contained in a comment submitted, other than business confidential information, is confidential in accordance with Section 135(g)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(g)(2)). If the submitter believes that information or advice may qualify as such, the submitter:

(1) Must clearly so designate the information or advice;

(2) Must clearly mark the material as ''SUBMITTED IN CONFIDENCE''

at the top and bottom of the cover page and each succeeding page; and

(3) Must provide a non-confidential summary of the information or advice.

Any comment containing confidential information must be submitted by fax. A non-confidential summary of the confidential information must be submitted to *www.regulations.gov*. The non-confidential summary will be placed in the docket and will be open to public inspection.

Pursuant to section 127(e) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3537(e)), USTR will maintain a docket on this dispute settlement proceeding, docket number USTR–2014–0001, accessible to the public at *www.regulations.gov*.

The public file will include non-confidential comments received by USTR from the public regarding the dispute. The following documents will be made available to the public at *www.ustr.gov:* The U.S. submissions, any non-confidential summaries or submissions received from other participants in the dispute, and any non-confidential summaries of submissions received from other participants in the dispute.

The report of the panel in this proceeding and, if applicable, the report of the Appellate Body, will be available on the Web site of the World Trade Organization, at *www.wto.org*. Comments open to public inspection may be viewed at *www.regulations.gov*.

**Juan Millan,**

*Assistant United States Trade Representative for Monitoring and Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 2014–07876 Filed 4–7–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3290–F4–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Highway Administration

### Notice To Rescind a Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement: Orange and San Diego Counties, CA

**AGENCY:** Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Department of Transportation.

**ACTION:** Notice to rescind a Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

**SUMMARY:** The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that it is rescinding two Notices of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a proposal to construct the extension of State Route 241 to Interstate 5 (I–5) in southern Orange County and northern San Diego County. The FHWA published the initial NOI in the **Federal Register** on February 20, 2001 and a supplemental NOI in the **Federal Register** on March 14, 2001. These rescissions are due in part to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce's December 2008 decision upholding the California Coastal Commission's (CCC) objection to the Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency's (TCA) consistency determination for the proposed project. This NOI rescinds both NOIs.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tay Dam, Senior Transportation Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, California Division, Cal South Office, 888 S. Figueroa, Ste. 750, Los Angeles, California 90017, or Adnan Maiah, Project Manager, Caltrans-District 12, 3347 Michelson Drive, Suite 100, Irvine, CA. 92612.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FHWA, in coordination with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and TCA, issued two NOIs on February 20, 2001 and March 14, 2001, to prepare an EIS for the proposed project. The project purpose was to alleviate future traffic congestion on I–5 and the arterial network in the southern Orange County area. The supplemental NOI provided notice of the preparation of a joint EIS pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and an Environmental Impact Report pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

In February 2008, the CCC objected to TCA's consistency determination for its Preferred Alternative under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. TCA appealed the objection to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce, which upheld the CCC's decision in December 2008. Subsequently, TCA began exploring possible modifications and/or alternatives to the Southern Orange County Transportation Infrastructure Improvement Plan (SOCTIIP).

After consultation with TCA and Caltrans, the FHWA is rescinding the initial and supplemental NOIs based, in part, on the U.S. Secretary of Commerce's December 2008 decision. Continued operational and environmental studies conducted after the December 2008 decision did not result in a resolution of CCC concerns regarding the locally preferred alternative. Any future transportation improvements would be treated as a new project and would need to be initiated and proceed under separate environmental review processes, in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: April 2, 2014.

**Larry Vinzant,**

*Senior Environmental Protection Specialist, Sacramento, California.*

[FR Doc. 2014–07803 Filed 4–7–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–22–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

**[Docket No. FMCSA–2013–0069]**

### Hours of Service of Drivers: Timberdoodle Company's Application for Exemption

**AGENCY:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of final disposition; denial of application for exemption.

**SUMMARY:** FMCSA announces its denial of Timberdoodle Company's (Timberdoodle) request for an exemption from section 395.3(b)(1) of the ''Hours of Service [HOS] of Drivers'' regulations (49 CFR part 395). Section 395.3(b)(1) prohibits the operation of a