conference call number and conference ID number.

Members of the public are entitled to make comments during the open period at the end of the meeting. Members of the public may also submit written comments; the comments must be received in the Regional Programs Unit within 30 days following the meeting. Written comments may be mailed to the Western Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 300 North Los Angeles Street, Suite 2010, Los Angeles, CA 90012. They may also be emailed to Ana Victoria Fortes at afortes@usccr.gov.

Records and documents discussed during the meeting will be available for public viewing prior to and after the meeting at https://www.facadatabase.gov/FACA/FACAPublicViewCommitteeDetails?

id=a10t0000001gzlJAAQ.

Records generated from this meeting may also be inspected and reproduced at the Regional Programs Unit, as they become available, both before and after the meeting. Persons interested in the work of this Committee are directed to the Commission's website, <a href="http://www.usccr.gov">http://www.usccr.gov</a>, or may contact the Regional Programs Unit at the above email or street address.

# Agenda

I. Welcome
II. Nominate Vice Chair
III. Concept Stage Presentation
IV. Review Civil Rights Topics
V. Public Comment
VI. Discuss Next Steps
VII. Good of the Order
VIII. Adjournment

Dated: June 22, 2020.

### David Mussatt,

Supervisory Chief, Regional Programs Unit. [FR Doc. 2020–13777 Filed 6–25–20; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE P

# DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration [A-570-012, C-570-013]

Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From the People's Republic of China: Continuation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders

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

SUMMARY: As a result of the determinations by the Department of Commerce (Commerce) and the International Trade Commission (ITC) that revocation of the antidumping (AD)

and countervailing duty (CVD) orders on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from the People's Republic of China (China) would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, countervailable subsidies, and material injury to an industry in the United States, Commerce is publishing a notice of continuation of these AD and CVD orders.

DATES: Applicable June 26, 2020.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ian Hamilton, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4798.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### **Background**

On January 8, 2015, Commerce published both the AD and CVD orders on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from China.<sup>1</sup> On December 2, 2019, the ITC instituted,2 and on Commerce initiated,3 the five-year (sunset) reviews of the AD and CVD orders on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from China, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). As a result of its reviews, Commerce determined that revocation of the Orders on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and countervailable subsidies and, therefore, notified the ITC of the magnitude of the margins and net subsidy rates likely to prevail should the Orders be revoked.4 On June 19, 2020, the ITC published its determinations, pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752(a) of the Act, that revocation of the Orders would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the

United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.<sup>5</sup>

## **Scope of the Orders**

The merchandise covered by these Orders is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately circular cross section, less than 19.00 mm in actual solid crosssectional diameter. Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions for (a) stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; or (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are free cutting steel (also known as free machining steel) products (i.e., products that contain by weight one or more of the following elements: 0.1 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium). All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope.

The products subject to these Orders are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3011, 7213.91.3015, 7213.91.3020, 7213.91.3093; 7213.91.4500, 7213.91.6000, 7213.99.0030, 7227.20.0030, 7227.20.0080, 7227.90.6010, 7227.90.6020, 7227.90.6030, and 7227.90.6035 of the HTSUS. Products entered under subheadings 7213.99.0090 and 7227.90.6090 of the HTSUS also may be included in this scope if they meet the physical description of subject merchandise above. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise covered by these Orders is dispositive.

# **Continuation of the Orders**

As a result of the determinations by Commerce and the ITC that revocation of the *Orders* would likely lead to a continuation or a recurrence of dumping and countervailable subsidies and of material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(a), Commerce hereby orders the continuation of the *Orders*. U.S. Customs and Border Protection will

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from the People's Republic of China: Antidumping Duty Order, 80 FR 1015 (January 8, 2015); see also Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from the People's Republic of China: Amended Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Countervailing Duty Order, 80 FR 1018 (January 8, 2015) (collectively, Orders).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from China; Institution of Five-Year Reviews, 84 FR 66007 (December 2, 2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See Initiation of Five-Year (Sunset) Reviews, 84 FR 65968 (December 2, 2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited First Five-Year Sunset Review of the Countervailing Duty Order, 85 FR 17533 (March 30, 2020), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM); and Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited First Five-Year Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order, 85 FR 19136 (April 6, 2020), and accompanying IDM.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Carbon and Alloy Steel Wire Rod from China (Inv. Nos. 701–TA–512 and 731–TA–1248 (Review)), 85 FR 37108 (June 19, 2020); see also Carbon and Alloy Steel Wire Rod from China (Inv. Nos. 701–TA–512 and 731–TA–1248 (Review)), USITC Pub. 5064 (June 2020).

continue to collect AD and CVD cash deposits at the rates in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise. The effective date of the continuation of the *Orders* will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this notice of continuation. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(c)(2), Commerce intends to initiate the next five-year review of the *Orders* not later than 30 days prior to the fifth anniversary of the effective date of continuation.

#### Administrative Protective Order

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return/destruction or conversion to judicial protective order of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO which may be subject to sanctions.

#### **Notification to Interested Parties**

These five-year (sunset) reviews and this notice are in accordance with sections 751(c) and (d)(2) of the Act and published in accordance with section 777(i) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4). Note that Commerce has modified certain of its requirements for serving documents containing business proprietary information, until July 17, 2020, unless extended.<sup>6</sup>

Dated: June 22, 2020.

# Jeffrey I. Kessler,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2020–13811 Filed 6–25–20; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

# **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

# **International Trade Administration**

[A-122-857; C-122-858]

Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders on Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Scope Ruling and Notice of Amended Final Scope Ruling Pursuant to Court Decision

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (Commerce) is notifying the public that the Court of International Trade's (CIT) final judgment in *Shake and Shingle* 

Alliance v. United States, Court No. 18–00228, is not in harmony with Commerce's final scope ruling and is, therefore, finding that certain cedar shakes and shingles exported by the Shake and Shingle Alliance (SSA) are not within the scope of the antidumping (AD) and countervailing duty (CVD) orders on certain softwood lumber (softwood lumber) from Canada.

DATES: Applicable April 30, 2020.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Maisha Cryor, AD/CVD Operations,
Enforcement and Compliance,
International Trade Administration,
U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401
Constitution Avenue NW, Washington,
DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5831.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### **Background**

Commerce issued the AD and CVD orders on softwood lumber from Canada on January 3, 2018.¹ On September 10, 2018, in response to a scope ruling request filed by SSA, Commerce issued its Final Scope Ruling, finding that certain cedar shakes and shingles exported by SSA are covered by the scope of the *Orders*.² As a result of the Final Scope Ruling, Commerce instructed U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to continue suspension of liquidation of entries of SAA's certain cedar shakes and shingles.³

SAA challenged Commerce's Final Scope Ruling before the CIT. On November 13, 2019, the CIT remanded the Final Scope Ruling to Commerce to further consider the record as it pertains to the determination of the subject merchandise, to further consider record evidence as it pertains to the determination of whether cedar shakes and shingles are within the scope of the *Orders*, and to further consider prior determinations, including but not limited to scope rulings, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.225(k)(1).4

Pursuant to the CIT's Remand Order, on remand, Commerce reconsidered its Final Scope Ruling and determined that SSA's certain cedar shakes and shingles do not fall within the scope of the *Orders.*<sup>5</sup> Specifically, Commerce determined that the petitioner never intended for cedar shakes and shingles to be covered by the *Orders.*<sup>6</sup> On April 20, 2020, the CIT sustained Commerce's Final Remand Results.<sup>7</sup>

#### **Timken Notice**

In its decision in Timken,8 as clarified by Diamond Sawblades,9 the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) held that, pursuant to section 516A(c) and (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Commerce must publish a notice of a court decision that is not "in harmony" with a Commerce determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a "conclusive" court decision. The CIT's April 20, 2020, judgment in this case constitutes a final decision of the court that is not in harmony with Commerce's Final Scope Ruling. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of Timken.

# **Amended Final Scope Ruling**

Because there is now a final court decision with respect to this case, Commerce is amending its final scope ruling and finds that the scope of the *Orders* do not cover certain cedar shakes and shingles exported by SSA. Commerce will instruct CBP to liquidate entries of certain cedar shakes and shingles exported by SSA without regard to AD and or CVD duties, and to lift suspension of liquidation of such entries.

#### **Notification to Interested Parties**

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 516A(e)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 22, 2020.

#### Joseph A. Laroski Jr.,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations.

[FR Doc. 2020–13812 Filed 6–25–20; 8:45 am]

#### BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See Temporary Rule Modifying AD/CVD Service Requirements Due to COVID-19; Extension of Effective Period, 85 FR 29615 (May 18, 2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Certain Softwood Lumber Products From Canada: Amended Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Countervailing Duty Order, 83 FR 347 (January 3, 2018); and Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada: Antidumping Duty Order and Partial Amended Final Determination, 83 FR 350 (January 3, 2018) (collectively, the Orders).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders on Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada: Final Scope Ruling—Cedar Shakes and Shingles, dated September 10, 2018 (Final Scope Ruling).

 $<sup>^3</sup>$  See CBP Message Numbers 9045306 and 9045308, dated February 14, 2019.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Shake and Shingle Alliance v. United States, Slip Op. 19–140, Court No. 18–00228 (CIT 2019) (Remand Order).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Shake and Shingle Alliance v. United States, Court No. 18–00228, Slip Op. 19–140 (CIT November 2019), dated February 13, 2020 (Final Remand Results).

<sup>6</sup> Id. at 15.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Shake and Shingle Alliance v. United States, Court No. 18–00228, Slip Op. 20–52 (CIT April 20, 2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See Timken Co. v. United States, 893 F.2d 337, 341 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States, 626 F. 3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (Diamond Sawblades).