

activities; (2) whether or not the information in the analysis is sufficient to implement proposed activities; and (3) which actions, if any, to approve.

#### Preliminary Issues

The following potential issues and concerns were identified via internal scoping and collaboration efforts: (1) Beetle spread from NFS lands to adjacent private lands; (2) cumulative impacts of past and proposed treatments; (3) intensity of vegetative treatments and slash disposal adjacent to wildland-urban interface areas; (4) ingress/egress for forest users and property owners; and (5) management of mapped and inventoried old growth stands.

#### Comment Requested

This notice of intent initiates the scoping process that guides the development of the environmental impact statement. Comments that are site-specific in nature are most helpful to resource professionals when trying to narrow and address the public's issue and concerns. Comments on the Spruce Gulch proposal will be accepted until February 15, 2008 as identified previously in this notice of intent. Comments will be reviewed and issues will be identified. Issues that cannot be resolved by design criteria or minor changes to the Proposed Action may generate alternatives to the Proposed Action. This process is driven by comments received from the public, other agencies, and internal Forest Service concerns. To assist in commenting, a scoping letter providing more detail on the project proposal has been prepared and is available to interested parties. Contact Melissa Martin, Project Coordinator, at the address listed in this notice of intent if you would like to receive a copy.

#### Release of Names

Comments received in response to this solicitation, including names and addresses of those who commented, will be considered part of the public record on this Proposed Action and will be available for public inspection. Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered; however, those who submit anonymous comments will not have standing to object to the subsequent decision under 36 CFR Part 218. Additionally, pursuant to 7 CFR 1.27(d), any person may request the agency to withhold a submission from the public record by showing how the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) permits such confidentiality. Persons requesting such confidentiality should be aware that,

under the FOIA, confidentiality may be granted in only very limited circumstances, such as to protect trade secrets. The Forest Service will inform the requester of the agency's decision regarding the request for confidentiality, and where the request is denied, the agency will return the submission and notify the requester that the comments may be resubmitted with or without name and address within ten (10) days.

#### Early Notice of Importance of Public Participation in Subsequent Environmental Review

A draft environmental impact statement will be prepared for comment. The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date of the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, that it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised during the draft environmental impact statement stage, but are not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement, may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this Proposed Action participate by the close of the 45-day comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns related to the Proposed Action, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft document. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives displayed in the document. Reviewers should refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations

at 40 CFR 1503.3 for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act for addressing these points.

Dated: January 9, 2008.

**Thomas A. Florich,**

*Acting Laramie District Ranger.*

[FR Doc. 08-113 Filed 1-16-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### San Juan National Forest; Columbine Ranger District; Colorado; Hermosa Landscape Grazing Analysis

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

**SUMMARY:** The San Juan National Forest proposes to continue to authorize livestock grazing on all or portions of the Missionary Ridge-Lakes Landscape in a manner that moves resource conditions toward desired on-the-ground conditions and is consistent with Forest Plan standards and guidelines. The analysis area encompasses approximately 119,000 acres on 12 active cattle allotments: Bear Creek, Coon Creek, Elkhorn, Graham Creek, Haflin Creek, Jack Creek, Lemon, Lion Creek, Red Creek, Stevens/Shearer, Vallecito, and Waldner Allotments. The area is located north of Durango and Bayfield, Colorado; from the Animas Valley on the west to just past the La Plata County line on the east; in T35N and T36N, R5-9W, N.M.P.M. and is within the Columbine Ranger District, San Juan National Forest, Colorado.

The proposed action is designed to increase the flexibility of livestock grazing systems through adaptive management, which will allow quicker and more effective response to problems areas when they are revealed. Problems will be revealed through the use of short and long term monitoring. Application of adaptive management practices should result in healthier soil, watershed, and vegetative conditions.

**DATES:** Comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be received on or before February 19, 2008. The draft environmental impact statement is expected in June 2008 and the final environmental impact statement is expected in September 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Cam Hooley, Environmental Coordinator, Columbine Public Lands, POB 439, 367 South Pearl Street, Bayfield, CO 81122; e-mail [chooley@fs.fed.us](mailto:chooley@fs.fed.us).

For further information, mail correspondence to Rowdy Wood, Rangeland Management Specialist, Columbine Public Lands, POB 439, 367 South Pearl Street, Bayfield, CO 81122; e-mail [rwood03@fs.fed.us](mailto:rwood03@fs.fed.us).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rowdy Wood, Rangeland Management Specialist, Columbine Public Lands, 970-884-1416.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Purpose and Need for Action**

The purpose of this project is to reauthorize grazing on all or portions of the Hermosa Landscape in such a manner that will move resource conditions toward desired conditions and be consistent with Forest Plan standards and guidelines. There is a need to move some existing conditions towards desired conditions. Livestock grazing has been identified in the Forest Plan as an appropriate use of the Forest and falls under the multiple-use mandate of the Forest Service. This action is needed at this time because in the early 1990's, the courts determined that livestock grazing permits should not be re-issued without a NEPA analysis. This put many livestock operations at risk until such time as these analyses could be completed. In response, Congress passed the Rescissions Act of 1995, which provided for continuation of permit issuance if the only reason they could not be issued was lack of a NEPA analysis. The Act directed the Forest Service to develop and adhere to a schedule for completion of the analyses. This project analysis is being undertaken as part of the schedule that was developed for the San Juan National Forest.

**Proposed Action**

The proposed action is to continue to permit livestock grazing by incorporating adaptive management strategies across the Hermosa Landscape. Adaptive Management is defined as the process of making use of monitoring information to determine if management changes are needed, and if so, what changes, and to what degree. An adaptive management strategy would define the desired resource conditions, monitoring requirements, resource triggers or thresholds, and actions to be taken if triggers are reached. Site-specific actions to move the existing ground conditions toward desired conditions could also be identified.

**Possible Alternatives**

The following alternatives have been preliminarily identified: No Action

Alternative. The proposed project as described above would not occur. Grazing would not be reauthorized on these allotments. Traditional Management Alternative (No change from current). This alternative is based on analyzing a specific number of livestock and specific grazing dates in specific pastures. This has been the conventional approach to grazing analysis. Adaptive Management Alternative (Proposed Action). Described above. This alternative is based on meeting certain resource conditions using a variety of "tools", or actions, to reach or maintain those conditions.

**Responsible Official**

Pauline E. Ellis, Columbine District Ranger/Field Office Manager, POB 439, 367 South Pearl Street, Bayfield, CO, 81122.

**Nature of Decision To Be Made**

Given the purpose and need, the deciding official reviews the proposed action and the other alternatives in order to make the following decisions: Will livestock grazing will proceed as proposed, as modified, or not at all, on all or part of the Missionary Ridge-Lakes landscape? If livestock grazing proceeds: Where will on-the-ground activities occur, and what types of associated activities will occur? What mitigation measures and monitoring requirements will the Forest Service apply to the project? If Adaptive Management is chosen, how will monitoring be used to guide when adaptive options will be activated?

**Scoping Process**

Scoping is initiated with the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. A news release will be issued and scoping letters will be mailed to affected individuals during January 2008, and the project has been posted in the San Juan National Forest Quarterly Schedule of Proposed Actions since January 2008. A meeting with the current term grazing permit holders in the project landscape was held on March 15, 2007, and another will be held on January 25, 2008 at 2:30 p.m. the Lavena McCoy Public Library in Bayfield, Colorado.

**Preliminary Issues**

During internal review and analysis of monitoring data, the Columbine District/Field Office has already identified the following concerns or issues with the proposal: Livestock can affect plant community species composition and vigor; Livestock can impact riparian areas and watershed

conditions; Livestock can impact wildlife habitat, including habitat for special status species such as Canada lynx and Colorado River cutthroat trout; Livestock can conflict with recreation in developed campgrounds and trailheads.

**Comment Requested**

This notice of intent initiates the scoping process which guides the development of the environmental impact statement. Comments regarding the scope of issues to be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement are requested, and should be relevant to the nature of the decision to be made.

*Early Notice of Importance of Public Participation in Subsequent Environmental Review:* A draft environmental impact statement will be prepared for comment. The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental impact statement stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45 day comment period so that comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the

alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Comments received, including the names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposal and will be available for public inspection.

(Authority: 40 CFR 1501.7 and 1508.22; Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, Section 21)

Dated: January 9, 2008.

**Pauline E. Ellis,**

*District Ranger/Field Office Manager.*

[FR Doc. E8-749 Filed 1-16-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-849]

#### Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From the People's Republic of China; Initiation of New Shipper Review

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 17, 2008.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the "Department") has determined that a request for a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length steel plate ("CTL steel plate") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"), received in November 2007, meets the statutory and regulatory requirements for initiation. The period of review ("POR") of this new shipper review is November 1, 2006, through October 31, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Demitrios Kalogeropoulos or Blanche Ziv, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2623 and (202) 482-4207, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The notice announcing the antidumping duty order on CTL steel plate from the PRC was published on October 21, 2003. See *Suspension Agreement on Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From the People's Republic of China; Termination of*

*Suspension Agreement and Notice of Antidumping Duty Order*, 68 FR 60081 (October 21, 2003). On November 30, 2007, we received a timely request for a new shipper review from Hunan Valin Xiangtan Iron & Steel Co., Ltd. ("Hunan Valin") in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(d)(2). Hunan Valin has certified that it produced and exported the CTL steel plate on which it based its request for a new shipper review. The Department initially denied Hunan Valin's request for a new shipper review in this case. However, as a result of subsequent information submitted by the requester, the Department has reconsidered its decision and is now initiating the new shipper review.

#### Initiation of New Shipper Reviews

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i)(I) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2), Hunan Valin certified that it did not export CTL steel plate to the United States during the period of investigation ("POI"). Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i)(II) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(A), Hunan Valin certified that, since the initiation of the investigation, it has never been affiliated with any exporter or producer who exported CTL steel plate to the United States during the POI, including those not individually examined during the investigation. As required by 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(B), Hunan Valin also certified that its export activities were not controlled by the central government of the PRC.

In addition to the certifications described above, the exporter submitted documentation establishing the following: (1) The date on which it first shipped CTL steel plate for export to the United States and the date on which the CTL steel plate was first entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption; (2) the volume of its first shipment; and (3) the date of its first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States.

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(d)(1), we are initiating this new shipper review for shipments of CTL steel plate from the PRC produced and exported by Hunan Valin.

The POR is November 1, 2006, through October 31, 2007. See 19 CFR 351.214(g)(1)(i)(B). We intend to issue preliminary results of these reviews no later than 180 days from the date of initiation, and final results of these reviews no later than 270 days from the date of initiation. See section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act.

On August 17, 2006, the Pension Protection Act of 2006 ("H.R. 4") was signed into law. Section 1632 of H.R. 4

temporarily suspends the authority of the Department to instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to collect a bond or other security in lieu of a cash deposit in new shipper reviews during the period April 1, 2006, through June 30, 2009. Therefore, the posting of a bond or other security under section 751(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act in lieu of a cash deposit is not available in this case. Importers of CTL steel plate manufactured and exported by Hunan Valin must continue to pay a cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties on each entry of subject merchandise at the current PRC-wide rate of 128.59 percent.

Interested parties requiring access to proprietary information in this new shipper review should submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306. This initiation and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214 and 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: January 11, 2008.

**Stephen J. Claeys,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E8-788 Filed 1-16-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-803]

#### Heavy Forged Hand Tools From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review

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

**SUMMARY:** On November 20, 2007, the United States Court of International Trade ("CIT") sustained the remand redetermination issued by the Department of Commerce ("the Department") pursuant to the CIT's remand of the final results of the twelfth administrative review of the antidumping duty orders on heavy forged hand tools from the People's Republic of China. See *Shandong Huarong Machinery Co. Ltd., Shandong Machinery Import & Export Corporation, Liaoning Machinery Import & Export Corporation, and Tianjin Machinery Import & Export Corporation v. United States*, Slip Op. 07-169 (CIT, 2007) ("*Shandong Huarong II*"). On January 8, 2008, the CIT released the public version of this opinion. This case