Hazard trees would be removed from along Maintenance Level 3, 4 and 5 roads (generally, surfaced roads) and high-use Maintenance Level 2 roads (generally native-surface roads). Identification of hazard trees would follow guidelines in the Plumas National Forest Roadside/Facility Hazard Tree Abatement Action Plan (2003).

Lead Agency: The USDA Forest Service is the lead agency for this proposal.

Responsible Official: Plumas National Acting Forest Supervisor, Robert G. MacWhorter is the responsible official; Plumas National Forest, P.O. Box 11500, Quincy, CA 95971.

Nature of Decision To Be Made

The responsible official will decide whether to implement this project as proposed, implement the project based on an alternative to this proposal that is formulated to resolve identified issues or not implement this project at this time. The responsible official will be the Plumas National Forest Forest Supervisor.

Scoping Process

Public questions and comments regarding this proposal are an integral part of this environmental analysis process. Comments will be used to identify issues and disqualification alternatives to the proposed action. To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments should be as specific as possible.

A copy of the proposed action and/or a summary of the proposed action will be mailed to adjacent landowners, as well as to those people and organizations that have indicated a specific interest in the Freeman project, to Native American entities, and Federal, State and local agencies. The public will be notified of any meetings regarding this proposed by mailings and press releases sent to the local newspaper and media. There are no meetings planned at this time.

Permits or Licenses Required: An Air Pollution Permit and a Smoke Management Plan are required by local agencies.

Comment

This notice of intent initiates the scoping process which guides the development of the EIS. Our desire is to receive substantive comments on the merits of the proposed action, as well as comments that address errors, misinformation, or information that has been omitted. Substantive comments are defined as comments within the scope of the proposal, that have a direct relationship to the proposal, and that include supporting reasons for the responsible official's consideration.

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 as 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 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: August 19, 2005.

Kathleen L. Gay,

Acting Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 05–16898 Filed 8–24–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Economic Development Administration

Notice of Petitions by Producing Firms for Determination of Eligibility To Apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance

AGENCY: Economic Development Administration (EDA), Commerce.

ACTION: To give all interested parties an opportunity to comment.

Petitions have been accepted for filing on the dates indicated from the firms listed below.

LIST OF PETITION ACTION BY TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR PERIOD JULY 16, 2005–AUGUST 19, 2005

Firm name	Address	Date petition accepted	Product
Source Code Corporation	290 Vanderbilt Avenue Norwood, MA 02062.	10–Aug–05	Computers and servers.
ITA Corporation	2401 Research Boulevard Rockville, MD 20850.	25–Jul–05	Accounting and human resource software.

LIST OF PETITION ACTION BY TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR PERIOD JULY 16, 2005–AUGUST 19, 2005—Continued

Firm name	Address	Date petition accepted	Product
Rolco, Inc	946 East Hill Street Kasota, MN 56050.	29–Jul–05	Injection mold plastic components for general industrial, table games, medical equipment, electronics and automobiles.
Harden Furniture, Inc	8550 Mill Pond Way McConnellsville, NY 13401.	22–Jul–05	Hardwood end tables, entertainment centers, dining room tables and chairs, and beds and bedroom furniture.
Criterion Technology, Inc	101 McIntosh Parkway Thomaston, GA 30286.	22–Jul–05	Thermoformed or injection-molded acrylic and polycarbonate enclosures/castings, used primarily to protect security cameras.
Garmat USA, Inc	1401 West Standord Avenue Englewood, CO 80110.	26–Jul–05	Enclosure systems for process control in automotive applications.
Whirley Industries, Inc	618 Fourth Avenue Warren, PA 16365.	26–Jul–05	Plastic cups.
Trapper Peak Forge, Inc. d.b.a. Hacienda Iron Craft.	4072 Eastside Highway Stevensville, MT 59870.	29–Jul–05	Ornamental iron work.
Quality Metal Products, Inc	11500 West 13th Avenue Lakewood, CO 80215.	29–Jul–05	Counters, lockers, racks, display cases, shelves, partitions and similar fixtures of metal.
Sashco, Inc	10300 East 107th Place Brighton, CO 80601.	10–Aug–05	Acrylic polymer.
Marlin Firearms Company (The).	100 Kenna Drive North Haven, CT 06473.	16–Aug–05	Shotguns and rifles.
RMO, Inc	650 West Colfax Avenue Denver, CO 80204.	11–Aug–05	Non plastic dental fittings.
KALD Tool and Die Corporation.	3022 Highway 145 Richfield, WI 53076.	11–Aug–05	Molds for plastic injection molding and metal die casting.

The petitions were submitted pursuant to section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2341). Consequently, the United States Department of Commerce has initiated separate investigations to determine whether increased imports into the United States of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by each firm contributed importantly to total or partial separation of the firm's workers, or threat thereof, and to a decrease in sales or production of each petitioning firm. Any party having a substantial interest in the proceedings may request a public hearing on the matter. A request for a hearing must be received by Trade Adjustment Assistance, Room 7812, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230, no later than the close of business of the tenth calendar day following the publication of this notice. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance official program number and title of the program under which these petitions are submitted is 11.313, Trade Adjustment Assistance.

Dated: August 19, 2005.

Anthony J. Meyer,

Senior Program Analyst, Office of Strategic Initiatives.

[FR Doc. 05–16892 Filed 8–24–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–24–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

[Docket No. 04–BIS–14]

Action Affecting Export Privileges; Sunford Trading, Ltd.; In the Matter of: Sunford Trading Ltd., Room 2208, 22/F, 118 Connaught Road West, Hong Kong, China, Respondent; Order Relating to Sunford Trading, Ltd.

The Bureau of Industry and Security, U.S. Department of Commerce (''BIS'') has initiated an administrative proceeding against Sunford Trading, Ltd. (''Sunford'') pursuant to Section 766.3 of the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR parts 730–774 (2005)) (''Regulations''),[1] and Section 13(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 2401–2420 (2000)) (''Act''),[2] through issuance of a charging letter to Sunford that alleged that Sunford committed three violations of the Regulations. Specifically, the charges are:

1. *One violation of 15 CFR 764.2(e)—Ordering, Buying, Financing, and/or Forwarding Items to China With the Knowledge That a Violation of the Regulations Will Occur.* Beginning on or about November 23, 1998 and continuing to on or about July 20, 1999, Sunford ordered, bought, financed, and/or forwarded an industrial hot press furnace to the Beijing Research Institute of Materials and Technology (hereinafter, ''BRIMT'') in China with knowledge that a violation of the Regulations would occur. Specifically, at the time Sunford ordered, bought, financed, and/or forwarded the furnace, it knew or had reason to know that a Department of Commerce license was required for export to BRIMT under Section 744.3 of the Regulations, and that such license would not be obtained.

2. *One violation of 15 CFR 764.2(d)—Conspiring To Export an Industrial Furnace to China Without the Required U.S. Government Authorization.* Beginning on or about November 23, 1998 and continuing to on or about July 20, 1999, Sunford conspired or acted in concert with others, known and

[1] The violations charged occurred during 1999. The Regulations governing the violations at issue are found in the 1999 version of the Code of Federal Regulations (15 CFR parts 730–774 (1999)). The 2005 Regulations establish the procedures that apply to this matter.

[2] From August 21, 1994 through November 12, 2000, the Act was in lapse. During that period, the President, through Executive Order 12924, which had been extended by successive Presidential Notices, the last of which was August 3, 2000 (3 CFR, 2000 Comp. 397 (2001)), continued the Regulations in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701–1706 (2000)) (''IEEPA''). On November 13, 2000, the Act was reauthorized and it remained in effect through August 20, 2001. Since August 21, 2001, the Act has been in lapse and the President, through Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 (3 CFR, 2001 Comp. 783 (2002)), as extended by the Notice of August 6, 2004 (69 FR 48763, August 10, 2004), has continued the Regulations in effect under the IEEPA.