

percent. On the skyline and helicopter areas, trees greater than 16 inches dbh would be harvested. Limbs and tops in the skyline and helicopter areas would be lopped and scattered to a depth less than 18 inches in height. Skyline yarding would require one end suspension, with full suspension over intermittent or perennial streams. Dead conifers would be harvested from Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas. Equipment restriction zone widths within Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas would be established based on the stream type and steepness of the slope adjacent to the streams. Snags would be retained in snag retention areas, which are approximately ten acres in size, on approximately ten percent of the project area. Harvest activities would not occur within the snag retention areas except for operability (safety) reasons. Approximately 33 miles of temporary roads would be constructed.

Approximately 30 acres (fourteen landings) of helicopter landings would be constructed. Excess fuels on landings would be piled, a fireline constructed around the piles, and the piles burned. Following completion of the project, the temporary roads and landings would be subsoiled, reforested, and closed. Approximately 17,474 acres would be reforested with conifer seedlings in widely spaced clusters to emulate a naturally established forest. The areas would be reforested with a mixture of native species.

The Moonlight and Antelope Complex fires impacted twenty-five California spotted owl Protected Activity Centers (PACs). According to the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment FSEIS and ROD (2004), page 37, after a stand-replacing event, the habitat conditions are evaluated within a 1.5 mile radius around the activity center to identify opportunities for re-mapping the PAC. If there is insufficient suitable habitat for designating a PAC within the 1.5 mile radius, the PAC may be removed from the network.

#### Possible Alternatives

In addition to the proposed action, a no action alternative would be analyzed. Additional alternatives may be developed and analyzed throughout the environmental analysis.

#### Lead and Cooperating Agencies

The USDA, Forest Service is the lead agency for this proposal.

#### Responsible Official

Alice B. Carlton, Plumas National Forest Supervisor, PO Box 11500, Quincy, CA 95971.

#### Nature of Decision To Be Made

The decision to be made is whether to: (1) Implement the proposed action; (2) meet the purpose and need for action through some other combination of activities; or, (3) take no action at this time.

#### Scoping Process

Scoping is conducted to determine the significant issues that will be addressed during the environmental analysis. Comments that were received for the Moonlight Fire Recovery and Restoration Project and the Wheeler Fire Recovery and Restoration Project will be considered in the combined analysis. Additional comments on the Moonlight and Wheeler Fires Recovery and Restoration Project will also be considered. Scoping comments will be most helpful if received by May 23, 2008.

#### Permits or Licenses Required

An Air Pollution Permit and a Smoke Management Plan are required by local agencies.

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

A draft EIS will be prepared for comment. 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 EISs 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 EIS stage, but that are not raised until after completion of the final EIS, may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Rangoon 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 EIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and

concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft EIS 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 EIS 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: May 13, 2008.

**Mark Beaulieu,**

*Acting Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. E8-11222 Filed 5-21-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-M**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration (A-821-801)

#### Solid Urea from the Russian Federation: Final Results of Antidumping Duty New-Shipper Review and Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**SUMMARY:** On December 26, 2007, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of a new-shipper review of the antidumping duty order on solid urea from the Russian Federation. The solid urea subject to this review was produced and exported by MCC EuroChem (EuroChem). The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2006, through December 31, 2006. Based on our analysis of comments received, we have not made any changes to our calculation of EuroChem's antidumping-duty margin. Therefore, our final results are identical to our published preliminary results. The final results are listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of the New-Shipper Review". Furthermore, we are rescinding the concurrent administrative review of the antidumping duty order because it covers the same entry that we reviewed

in the context of the new-shipper review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 22, 2008.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas Schauer or Minoo Hatten, AD/CVD Operations, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0410 and (202) 482-1690, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

On December 26, 2007, the Department published the preliminary results of the new-shipper review of the antidumping duty order on solid urea from the Russian Federation. See *Solid Urea From the Russian Federation: Preliminary Results and Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of the Antidumping Duty New-Shipper Review*, 72 FR 72988 (December 26, 2007) (*Preliminary Results*). On February 27, 2008, we issued a post-preliminary analysis decision memorandum and margin recalculations concerning our sales-below-cost investigation of EuroChem.

On March 21, 2008, the Ad Hoc Committee of Domestic Nitrogen producers (the petitioner) withdrew its sales-below-cost allegation and requested that the Department terminate the cost investigation. On March 24, 2008, EuroChem submitted a letter arguing that the Department should not terminate the cost investigation. After considering all comments, on March 27, 2008, we terminated the cost investigation. See Memorandum from Minoo Hatten to Laurie Parkhill dated March 27, 2008.

On March 28, 2008, we received a case brief from the petitioner. On April 4, 2008, we received a rebuttal brief from EuroChem. Although the petitioner and EuroChem had requested a hearing, both parties withdrew their requests for a hearing on April 15, 2008.

### Scope of the Order

The merchandise under review is solid urea, a high-nitrogen content fertilizer which is produced by reacting ammonia with carbon dioxide. The product is currently classified under the Harmonized Tariff Schedules of the United States (HTSUS) item number 3102.10.00.00. Previously such merchandise was classified under item number 480.3000 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs

purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

### Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this new-shipper review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" (Decision Memorandum) from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated May 15, 2008, which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues which the parties have raised and to which we have responded is attached to this notice as an appendix. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised and corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in Import Administration's Central Records Unit, Room 1117 of the main Department building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum is available on the Internet at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

### Changes Since the Post-Preliminary Results

Because we terminated the cost investigation, the only change we have made has been to revert to the margin calculations we used for the published preliminary results in which we did not perform the cost test. See *Preliminary Results*, 72 FR at 72991, and the preliminary results analysis memorandum for EuroChem dated December 17, 2007, for our calculation of EuroChem's margin.

### Final Results of the New-Shipper Review

We determine that the weighted-average margin on solid urea from the Russian Federation produced and exported by EuroChem for the period July 1, 2006, through December 31, 2006, is zero percent.

### Rescission of Administrative Review

On August 20, 2007, we initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on solid urea from Russia for the period July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 72 FR 48613 (August 20, 2007).

Because we have analyzed the entry covered by the administrative review in the context of this concurrent new-shipper review, we are rescinding the administrative review.

### Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212. The Department will issue assessment instructions for EuroChem directly to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of these final results.

Because we found no margin for the U.S. sale subject to this new-shipper review, we will instruct CBP to liquidate the appropriate entry without regard to antidumping duties.

### Cash-Deposit Requirements

The following cash-deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of the new-shipper review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: 1) the cash-deposit rate for subject merchandise both manufactured and exported by EuroChem will be zero; 2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash-deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; 3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation but the manufacturer is, the cash-deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and 4) the cash-deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 64.93 percent, the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. See *Urea From the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 52 FR 19557 (May 26, 1987). These cash-deposit requirements shall remain in effect until further notice.

### Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

### Notification Regarding Administrative Protective Orders

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to an administrative protective order of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under such an order in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely notification of the return or destruction of administrative-protective-order materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an administrative protective order is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 15, 2008.

**David M. Spooner,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

### Appendix

*Comment 1: Qualification as a New Shipper*

*Comment 2: Bona-Fide Transaction*  
[FR Doc. E8-11520 Filed 5-21-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

A-549-822, A-552-802

### Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Notice of Extension of Time Limit for the Final Results of the Second Administrative Reviews

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 22, 2008.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Irina Itkin (Thailand) and Irene Gorelik (Vietnam), AD/CVD Operations, Offices 2 and 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0656 and (202) 482-6905, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### BACKGROUND

On March 6, 2008, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published notices for the preliminary results of the administrative reviews of

the antidumping duty orders on certain frozen warmwater shrimp from Thailand and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam ("Vietnam"), covering the period February 1, 2006, through January 31, 2007. *See Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand: Preliminary Results and Preliminary Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 12088 (March 6, 2008); and *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Preliminary Results, Preliminary Partial Rescission and Final Partial Rescission of the Second Administrative Review*, 73 FR 12127 (March 6, 2008). The final results for these administrative reviews are currently due no later than July 7, 2008, the next business day after 120 days from the date of publication of the preliminary results of review.

### EXTENSION OF TIME LIMIT FOR THE FINAL RESULTS

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), requires the Department issue the final results of an administrative review within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. If it is not practicable to complete the review within that time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the deadline for the final results to a maximum of 180 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published.

With respect to shrimp from Thailand, the Department requires additional time to properly consider the numerous and complex issues raised by interested parties in their case briefs. Similarly, with respect to shrimp from Vietnam, the Department requires additional time to consider the issues raised in case briefs from multiple interested parties, including the calculation of the dumping margins and the separate-rates status for numerous non-mandatory companies.

Thus, it is not practicable to complete these reviews within the original time limit. Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the final results of these reviews by 60 days, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. The final results are now due no later than September 2, 2008.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 15, 2008.

**Stephen J. Claeys,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E8-11511 Filed 5-21-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-549-821]

### Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From Thailand

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 22, 2008.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Dmitry Vladimirov, AD/CVD Operations, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0665.

### Background

At the request of interested parties, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene retail carrier bags from Thailand for the period August 1, 2006, through July 31, 2007. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 72 FR 54428, 54429 (September 25, 2007). On March 25, 2008, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice extending the due date for the completion of these preliminary results of review from May 2, 2008, to July 1, 2008. *See Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags from Thailand*, 73 FR 15724 (March 25, 2008).

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary determination is published. If it is not practicable to complete the review within these time periods, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary determination to a