comment. The final EIS and decision is expected in December 2006. Public questions and comments regarding this proposal are an integral part of the environmental analysis process. Comments will be used to identify issues and develop alternatives to this proposal. To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments should be as specific as possible.

Preliminary Issues

A. Long standing outfitter guide operators have not received 5-year term or priority use permits.

B. Levels of authorized outfitter-guide use (too much commercial use for some and not enough opportunities for others) and limits on the number of permits in the popular and highly marketable tourist locations: such as, Broken Arrow, Soldier Pass, Greasy Spoon, Honanki, etc.

C. The Forest Service has not authorized increased opportunities for existing outfitter-guides with temporary permits.

D. Sustaining of historic permits, versus adjusting/limiting authorizations and opening up new competitive opportunities.

E. The Forest Service has not issued new outfitter-guide authorizations in the greater Sedona area.

F. Inconsistencies and deficiencies in outfitter-guide quality of service and performance.

G. Demand for group and large community events on the National Forest is inconsistent with current emphasis in the Forest Plan.

H. Lack of permit system for commercial wedding planning and operations on the National Forest.

I. Authorization and management of recreation events, such as size, location, type of event, limitations.

J. Authorization and management of institutional outfitter-guide activities.

K. Inconsistencies between desire of permit holders for unlimited business growth and current Forest Plan direction for encounter frequencies and limited commercial activities.

L. Perceived monopoly of business income related to certain locations.

M. Concern related to resource and infrastructure impacts and damage from outfitter-guide activities and general recreation use.

N. Implementation of new regulations.

O. Some existing outfitter guides allocations are not used and that non-use has not been available for others or administered under current policy.

P. Concerns about delay in completing reallocation of existing permitted guides.

Q. Displacement of general public use of area as a result of outfitter guide use, (common wedding or large group use locations.)

Comment Requested

This notice of intent initiates the scoping process which guides the development of the environmental impact statement. Comments should be as specific as possible including location of concern area, why the concern is important, and data supporting any information considered not accurate. Comments should also indicate interest in being included on a mailing list for the project with accurate mailing address and contact information.

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 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 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 20, 2006.

Nora B. Rasure,

Forest Supervisor, Coconino Naitonal Forest.

[FR Doc. 06–737 Filed 1–25–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–428–602]

Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Final Results of the Full Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: On October 28, 2005, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published a notice of preliminary results of the full sunset review of the antidumping duty order on brass sheet and strip (''BSS'') from Germany (70 FR 62093) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). We provided interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We did not receive comments from either domestic or respondent interested parties. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of this order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the ''Final Results of Review'' section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 26, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Audrey R. Twyman, Brandon Farlander, or David Goldberger, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of

Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20230; telephone: 202–482–3534, 202–482–0182, and 202–482–4136, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 28, 2005, the Department of Commerce (the ''Department'') published in the **Federal Register** a notice of preliminary results of the full sunset review of the antidumping duty order on BSS from Germany, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. *See Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Preliminary Results of the Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 70 FR 62093 (October 28, 2005) (''*Preliminary Results*''). In our *Preliminary Results*, we determined that revocation of the order would likely result in continuation or recurrence of dumping with a margin of 3.81 percent for Wieland–Werke AG and an ''all others'' rate of 7.30 percent. We did not receive a case brief on behalf of either domestic or respondent interested parties within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i).

Scope of the Order

The product covered by this order is brass sheet and strip, other than leaded and tinned. The chemical composition of the covered product is currently defined in the Copper Development Association (''C.D.A.'') 200 Series or the Unified Numbering System (''U.N.S.'') C2000. This order does not cover products with chemical compositions that are defined by anything other than either the C.D.A. or U.N.S. series. In physical dimensions, the product covered by this order has a solid rectangular cross section over 0.0006 inches (0.15 millimeters) through 0.1888 inches (4.8 millimeters) in finished thickness or gauge, regardless of width. Coiled, wound–on-reels (traverse wound), and cut–to-length products are included. The merchandise is currently classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') item numbers 7409.21.00 and 7409.29.00. The HTSUS numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

The Department did not receive case briefs from either domestic or respondent interested parties. Therefore, we have not made any changes to our *Preliminary Results*.

Final Results of Review

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on BSS from Germany would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted–average margins:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Margin (percent)
Wieland–Werke AG	3.81
All Others	7.30

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (''APO'') of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing these results in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 20, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–992 Filed 1–25–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–357–812]

Honey from Argentina: Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Review

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

ACTION: Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 26, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Cordell or Robert James, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0408 or (202) 482–0469, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department received a timely request from Patagonik S.A. (Patagonik), in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(c), for a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on honey from Argentina. *See Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Honey from Argentina*, 66 FR 63672 (December 10, 2001). Patagonik identified itself as the exporter of subject merchandise produced by its supplier Colmenares Santa Rosa s.r.l.

As required by 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(i),(ii), and (iii)(A), Patagonik certified it did not export honey to the United States during the period of investigation (POI), and that it has never been affiliated with any exporter or producer which exported honey during the POI. As required by 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(ii)(B), Patagonik's supplier, Colmenares Santa Rosa s.r.l., certified that it did not export the subject merchandise to the United States during the POI. Our inquires and Customs run queries with U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) show that the shipment entered the United States shortly after the anniversary month.

Under section 351.214(f)(2)(ii) of the Department's regulations, when the sale of the subject merchandise occurs within the period of review (POR), but the entry occurs after the normal POR, the POR may be extended unless it would be likely to prevent the completion of the review within the time limits set by the Department's regulations. The preamble to the Department's regulations states that both the entry and the sale should occur during the POR, and that under ''appropriate'' circumstances the Department has the flexibility to extend the POR. *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27319, 27320 (May 19, 1997). In this instance, Patagonik's shipment entered in the month following the end of the POR. The Department does not find that this delay prevents the completion of the review within the time limits set by the Department's regulations. Accordingly, we are extending the POR by one month to capture both the sale and subsequent entry during the New Shipper POR.

Scope

The merchandise under review is honey from the Argentina. The products covered are natural honey, artificial honey containing more than 50 percent natural honey by weight, preparations of natural honey containing more than 50 percent natural honey by weight, and flavored honey. The subject merchandise includes all grades and colors of honey whether in liquid, creamed, comb, cut comb, or chunk form, and whether packaged for retail or in bulk form. The merchandise under