would separate claims about livestock production practices on product labeling.

The majority of claims currently citing naturally raised animal production methods are defined by the individual company selling the product. Depending upon the branded program making the claims, the production activities and associated requirements can vary since there is currently no standard to specify which attributes must be addressed and to what level, other than to be truthful and not misleading. This has led to confusion in the industry and the marketplace as to what requirements must be met in order to have a uniform, explicit claim that can be easily understood. This confusion has caused AMS to develop and propose a standard with explicit attributes that could easily be understood by the public as the basis for a naturally raised marketing claim as it relates to live animal production practices. AMS seeks comment from the public concerning its development and requirements.

Proposed Standard

To develop and propose a marketing claim standard for naturally raised, AMS conducted three listening sessions in December 2006 and January 2007 in Washington, DC, Denver, CO, and Seattle, WA, to seek oral and written comments regarding the use of a naturally raised marketing claim standard. Public input and comments related to a naturally raised marketing claim are posted on the Web site at *http://www.ams.usda.gov/lsg/stand/naturalclaim.htm.* AMS evaluated the public input and comments and is seeking further comments on a proposed naturally raised marketing claim standard.

AMS also reviewed consumer research along with the comments and identified, based upon this information, that production practices such as the prohibited use of antibiotics, growth promotants, and certain animal by-products are the main attributes consumers want for meat and meat products derived from livestock that are naturally raised. These are the attributes that AMS' proposed naturally raised standard contains. Again, the naturally raised labeling claim proposed in this notice remains independent of the FSIS policy on the use of the term ''natural'' on product labeling and will only pertain to live animal production practices.

Accordingly, AMS seeks comments on the following proposed voluntary U.S. Standard for Livestock and Meat Marketing Claims, in this notice.

Proposed U.S. Standards for Livestock and Meat Marketing Claims, Naturally Raised Claim for Livestock and the Meat and Meat Products Derived From Such Livestock

Background: This proposed claim applies to livestock used for meat and meat products that were raised entirely without growth promotants, antibiotics, and mammalian or avian by-products.

The administration of growth hormones, including natural hormones, synthetic hormones, estrus suppressants, beta agonists, or other synthetic growth promotants is prohibited from birth to slaughter. Collectively, they are referred to in the naturally raised marketing claim standard as growth promotants.

No antibiotics can be administered, whether through feed or water, or by injection, from birth to slaughter. This includes low-level (sub-therapeutic) or therapeutic level doses, sulfonamides, ionophores, coccidiostats, or any other synthetic antimicrobial. If an animal is in need of medical attention, proper treatment should, of course, be administered in an attempt to improve the health of the animal. In the case where antibiotics or the stated prohibited substances are administered, the treated animal must be identified and excluded from the program. Health products that can be used for disease prevention in a naturally raised program are vaccines, parasite control products, antibody preparations, and bloat prevention and treatment products (e.g., feed grade microbials and buffers that help facilitate the animals digestive process).

The feeding of mammalian or avian by-products is prohibited. Livestock cannot be fed rations that include components that are mammalian or avian derived.

Vitamin and mineral supplementation is permissible.

Verification of the proposed claim will be accomplished through an audit of the production process. The producer must be able to verify for AMS that the naturally raised marketing claim standard requirements are being met through a detailed documented quality management system.

Claim and Standard

Naturally Raised—Livestock used for the production of meat and meat products have been raised entirely without growth promotants, antibiotics, and have never been fed mammalian or avian by-products. This information shall be contained on any label claim that an animal has been naturally raised.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1621–1627.

Dated: November 21, 2007.

Lloyd C. Day,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. E7–23103 Filed 11–27–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Clearwater National Forest; Idaho; Travel Management Plan

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

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

SUMMARY: The Forest Service gives notice of its intent to prepare a Travel Planning Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Clearwater National Forest (CNF). The proposed action would designate a site-specific transportation system and prohibit indiscriminate cross-country traffic. The EIS will analyze the effects of the proposed action and alternatives. The Clearwater National Forest invites comments and suggestions on the issues to be addressed. The agency gives notice of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis and decision-making process on the proposal so interested and affected members of the public may participate and contribute to the final decision.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope of the analysis must be received by December 14, 2007. A 45-day public comment period will follow the release of the draft environmental impact statement that is expected in June 2008. The final environmental impact statement is expected in January 2009.

ADDRESSES: Send written or electronic comments to: Lochsa Ranger District, Kamiah Ranger Station; Attn: Lois Foster, Interdisciplinary Team Leader; Rt. 2 Box 191; Kamiah, ID 83536; FAX 208–935–4275; E-mail *comments-northern-clearwater@fs.fed.us.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lois Foster, Interdisciplinary Team leader, (208) 935–4258.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Purpose and Need for Action is to (1) Implement national OHV Rule direction, (2) Limit indiscriminate cross-country motorized travel, (3) Designate selected roads and trails for motorized travel, (4) Designate appropriate acreas or routes for travel with over-snow vehicles, (5) Balance travel opportunities with maintenance and management capability including costs, (6) Provide for a better spectrum of motorized, non-motorized, and non-mechanized travel opportunities across

the CNF in recognition of the need to retain the charter of lands recommended for Wilderness designation and the CNF's ability to provide for non-motorized recreation opportunities that are not available on other land ownerships, (7) Manage impacts to Forest resources, (8) Improve clarity and consistency of existing travel restrictions, and (9) Amend the 1987 Forest Plan as necessary to accomplish the actions described above.

The need for revision of the Forest Plan is supported by nationwide awareness within the Forest Service of the negative effects of indiscriminate off-road travel by motorized users. These concerns led to publication of the Travel Management final rule on November 9, 2005 in the **Federal Register,** 36 CFR parts 212, 251, 261, 295 ''Travel Management:'' Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicles Use (**Federal Register** 2005: 79 FR 68264). The rule requires each National Forest to designate those roads, trails, and areas that are open to motor vehicle use. The rule prohibits use of motor vehicles off the designated system, as well as use of motor vehicles on routes and in areas that are not consistent with the designation. The rule does not require that over-snow vehicles, such as snowmobiles, are limited to a designated system by exempting them under 121.51, but also states in 212.81 that ''use by over-snow vehicles * * * on National Forest System lands may allowed, restricted, or prohibit.'' The CNF chose to include over-snow vehicles in the analysis.

The Proposed Action would designate motorized road and trail routes for summer travel on the Clearwater National Forest. Existing Conditions include roads and trails identified as open to motorized travel in the 2005 Travel Guide, plus any error corrections or project-level NEPA decisions made since then. The Proposed Action would include any changes from existing conditions, such as road to trail conversions, designating some roads previously not thought to be travelable, and not designating some roads that were previously thought to be travelable.

The transportation system for snow-free travel would include:

- 1,623 miles of roads open yearlong to all highway-legal vehicles (an increase of 8 miles compared to existing conditions);
- 509 miles of road open yearlong to small vehicles such as ATV's and motorcycles, but not including UTV's (an increase of 9 miles);
- 633 miles of roads open seasonally to all highway-legal vehicles (a decrease of 13 miles);
- 151 miles of roads open seasonally to small vehicles (a decrease of 1 mile);
- 93 miles of trails open yearlong to small vehicles (a change of 0 miles);
- 226 miles of trails open yearlong to motorcycles (a decrease of 178 miles);
- 75 miles of trails open seasonally to small vehicles (an increase of 2 miles); and
- 93 miles of trails open seasonally to motorcycles (a change of 0 miles).

The proposed action would also modify the dates of seasonal restrictions for roads and trails to reduce the variety of restricted periods, and ultimately improve the clarity of the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). Motorized travel up to 300 fee off of designated routes to access established campsites would be permitted in most areas. In certain areas, off-route travel would be permitted only to access specifically designated campsites.

Existing restrictions for bicycles on all but one road would be eliminated. Bicycle restrictions on roads would drop from a total of 10 miles currently to only 1 mile, which would be entirely within the CNF seed orchard. Areas recommended for wilderness by the Forest Plan would become off limits to bicycles. System trails available to bicycles would drop from 811 miles to 730 miles (a reduction of 81 miles).

Over-snow vehicle use would be restricted in areas recommended for wilderness by the Forest Plan. Within the areas where over-snow vehicle use would generally be permitted, there would continue to be some specific routes where over-snow vehicles would be restricted. Over-snow vehicle use would be prohibited forest-wide from October 1 to November 4. The transportation system for over-snow vehicles would include:

- 364 miles of groomed snowmobile routes (no change from existing conditions);
- 1,322,943 acres generally open to over-snow vehicles except for certain restricted routes;
- 3,484 acres of roads where over-snow vehicles would be permitted from November 5 until snowmelt in the spring, compared to 3,174 acres available currently (an increase of 310 acres); and
- 503,057 acres closed to over-snow vehicles, compared to 302,856 acres available currently (a decrease of 200,201 acres).

The numbers above are only approximate at this time.

The existing Forest Plan will be amended. When the Forest Plan was completed in 1987, trail vehicles were few and travel planning was focused almost completely on roads and highway vehicles. Motorized use has increased dramatically since then, and modern vehicles such as snowmobiles, ATV's, and motorcycles have capabilities that could not have been envisioned in 1987. The Forest Plan also contains some conflicting information regarding the intent for management of certain areas. Changes may include:

- Better coordination between the level of motorized travel and the focus of certain management areas, primarily those in roadless areas;
- Additions or changes to Forest Plan standards to permit implementation of the national Travel Management rule; and
- Other goals, objectives, and standards affecting travel management.

Possible Alternatives the Forest Service will consider include a no-action alternative, which will serve as a baseline for comparison of alternatives. The proposed action will be considered along with additional alternatives that will be developed to meet the purpose and need for action, and to address significant issues identified during scoping.

The Responsible Official is Thomas K. Reilly, Clearwater Forest Supervisor, Clearwater National Forest, 12730 Highway 12, Orofino, ID 83544.

The Decision to be Made is whether to adopt the proposed action, in whole or in part, or another alternative; and what mitigation measures and management requirements will be implemented.

The Scoping Process for the EIS is being initiated with this notice. The scoping process will identify issues to be analyzed in detail and will lead to the development of alternatives to the proposal. The Forest Service is seeking information and comments from other Federal, State, and local agencies; Tribal governments; and organizations and individuals who may be interested in or affected by the proposed action. Comments received in response to this notice, including the names and addresses of those who comment, will be part of the project record and available for public review. Public meetings will be scheduled during the scoping period. Times, dates and locations for the public meetings will be published in the Lewiston, Idaho *Lewiston Morning Tribune.*

Early Notice of Importance of Public Participation in Subsequent Environmental Review: A draft environmental impact statement will be prepared for comment. The second major opportunity for public input will

be when the Draft EIS is published. 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 Draft EIS is anticipated to be available for public review in June 2008. The comment period on the Draft EIS 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 is it 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. *Ho del*, 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 comment period for the Draft EIS 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 a 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.

After the comment period for the Draft EIS ends, the Forest Service will analyze comments received and address them in the Final EIS. The Final EIS is scheduled to be released by January 2009. The Responsible Official (Forest Supervisor Thomas K. Reilly) will document the decision and rationale in a Record of Decision (ROD). The decision will be subject to review under Forest Service appeal regulations at 36 CFR Part 215.

Preliminary Issues identified by the Forest Service interdisciplinary team include: Changing motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities, costs of road and trail management and maintenance, soil issues, effects on aquatic environments and species, effects on wildlife, the spread of noxious weeds, changes in motorized access to roads, trails and areas that are not designated as part of the travel planning analysis, and motorized access for people with disabilities.

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

Dated: November 7, 2007.

Thomas K. Reilly,

Clearwater Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 07–5861 Filed 11–27–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–846]

Brake Rotors From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the 2006 Semiannual New Shipper Review

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

SUMMARY: On September 25, 2007, the Department of Commerce (the ''Department'') published the preliminary results of the semiannual new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on brake rotors from the People's Republic of China. *See Brake Rotors From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of the 2006 Semiannual New Shipper Review*, 72 FR 54430 (September 25, 2007) (''*Preliminary Results*''). The merchandise covered by this review is brake rotors, exported and manufactured by Longkou Qizheng Auto Parts Co., Ltd. (''Qizheng''), as described in the ''Scope of the Order'' section of this notice. The period of review is April 1, 2006, through October 31, 2006. We invited parties to comment on our *Preliminary Results*. We received no comments, and no new evidence was placed on the record to cause us to question that determination. Therefore, the final results are unchanged from those presented in the Preliminary Results. The final weighted–average dumping margin for Qizheng is listed below in the section entitled ''Final Results of the Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 28, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Moats 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) 482–5047 or (202) 482–4207, respectively.

Scope of the Order

The products covered by this order are brake rotors made of gray cast iron, whether finished, semifinished, or unfinished, ranging in diameter from 8 to 16 inches (20.32 to 40.64 centimeters) and in weight from 8 to 45 pounds (3.63 to 20.41 kilograms). The size parameters (weight and dimension) of the brake rotors limit their use to the following types of motor vehicles: automobiles, all–terrain vehicles, vans and recreational vehicles under ''one ton and a half,'' and light trucks designated as ''one ton and a half.''

Finished brake rotors are those that are ready for sale and installation without any further operations. Semi–finished rotors are those on which the surface is not entirely smooth, and have undergone some drilling. Unfinished rotors are those which have undergone some grinding or turning.

These brake rotors are for motor vehicles, and do not contain in the casting a logo of an original equipment manufacturer (''OEM'') which produces vehicles sold in the United States. (*e.g.*, General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Honda, Toyota, Volvo). Brake rotors covered in this order are not certified by OEM producers of vehicles sold in the United States. The scope also includes composite brake rotors that are made of gray cast iron, which contain a steel plate, but otherwise meet the above criteria. Excluded from the scope of this order are brake rotors made of gray cast iron, whether finished, semifinished, or unfinished, with a diameter less than 8 inches or greater than 16 inches (less than 20.32 centimeters or greater than 40.64 centimeters) and a weight less than 8 pounds or greater than 45 pounds (less than 3.63 kilograms or greater than 20.41 kilograms).[1]

[1] On January 17, 2007, the Department determined the brake rotors produced by Federal-Mogul and certified by the Ford Motor Company to be excluded from the scope of the order. *See* Memorandum from Blanche Ziv, Program Manager, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, through Wendy J. Frankel, Office Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, to Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant