either allow their importation or add them to the list of prohibited noxious weeds, we would like to ensure that our pest risk analysis process for potentially invasive plants is able to evaluate the risk posed by these plants as thoroughly and rigorously as possible.

Members of the APHIS Weed Team will participate in the electronic discussion. We will share all data and opinions offered during the discussion with other groups that are interested in methods to predict invasiveness for both plants and animals, such as the National Invasive Species Council Pathways Work Team and the North American Plant Protection Organization Invasive Species Panel.

Questions for Discussion

We would like participants in the electronic discussion to specifically address the following six questions, although general comments on the issue of evaluating invasiveness will be accepted as well.

1. What criteria, other than whether the plant has a history of invasiveness elsewhere, are most useful to determine the invasiveness of a plant introduced into the United States for the first time?

2. When there is little or no existing scientific literature or other information describing the invasiveness of a plant species, how much should we extrapolate from information on congeners (other species within the same genus)?

3. What specific scientific experiments should be conducted to best evaluate a plant's invasive potential? Should these experiments be conducted in a foreign area, in the United States, or both?

4. How should the results of such experiments be interpreted? Specifically, what results should be interpreted as providing conclusive information for a regulatory decision?

5. If field trials are necessary to determine the invasive potential of a plant, under what conditions should the research be conducted to prevent the escape of the plant into the environment?

6. What models or techniques are being used by the nursery industry, weed scientists, seed companies, botanical gardens, and others to screen plants that have not yet been widely introduced into the United States for invasiveness? What species have been rejected by these evaluators as a result of the use of these evaluation methods?

Accessing the Electronic Discussion

The electronic public discussion will be held from November 27, 2006 to January 26, 2007. We are beginning the discussion 2 weeks after this notice is published in the **Federal Register** to give participants time to consider the questions and assemble any relevant information.

While anyone can access the discussion and read the comments, registration is required in order to participate in the discussion. You will be asked to register at the time you post your comment. The discussion will be accessible through a link on Plant Protection and Quarantine's Web page for the nursery stock revision, *http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ppq/Q37/revision.html.* Participants will be required to enter their name and e-mail address. Affiliation and mailing address are optional. Only the participant names will be publicly displayed; the other information will allow us to contact you to resolve technical difficulties or request additional information or clarification. When the discussion begins, there will be a link to access the discussion itself on the nursery stock revision Web page.

The discussion will be convened using IBM Domino software, which allows participants to upload and view files as well as make posts in the discussion. The IBM Domino software supports Microsoft Internet Explorer and other major Web browsers for both Windows and Macintosh systems. Technical support will be available during the discussion. There is no cost to participate in the discussion.

Because APHIS staff will review posts as they are submitted, there may be some delay between the submission of a post and its availability in the public discussion. Multiple APHIS staff members will be monitoring the discussion, and we will try to minimize any delays.

If you wish to submit comments or other information on the topics described in this notice, but you do not wish to be part of the electronic discussion, you may send your comments via postal mail or commercial delivery to the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** at the beginning of this notice.

Done in Washington, DC, this 1st day of November 2006.

W. Ron DeHaven,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. E6–18768 Filed 11–9–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

Domestic Sugar Program—Final 2005-Crop and Initial 2006-Crop Cane Sugar and Sugar Beet Marketing Allotments and Company Allocations

AGENCY: Commodity Credit Corporation, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the final 2005-crop and initial 2006-crop cane state allotments and company allocations to sugarcane and sugar beet processors. The 2005-crop year runs from October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006 (fiscal year (FY) 2006). The 2006-crop (FY 2007) cane state allotments and company allocations are based on an 8.750 million short tons, raw value (STRV) overall allotment quantity (OAQ) of domestic sugar. These actions apply to all domestic sugar marketed for human consumption in the United States from October 1, 2006, through September 30, 2007. Although CCC already has announced all of the information in this notice, CCC is statutorily required to publish in the **Federal Register** determinations establishing, adjusting, or suspending sugar marketing allotments.

ADDRESSES: Barbara Fecso, Dairy and Sweeteners Analysis Group, Economic Policy and Analysis Staff, Farm Service Agency, USDA, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., STOP 0516, Washington, DC 20250–0516; telephone (202) 720–4146; FAX (202) 690–1480; e-mail: *barbara.fecso@wdc.usda.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barbara Fecso at (202) 720–4146.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Final FY 2006 State Allotments and Company Allocations

Section 359e(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, (7 U.S.C. 1359ee(b) requires the Secretary to reassign allocation to imports if it is determined that processors will be unable to market their allocations and there is no CCC inventory. In a July 27, 2006 news release, CCC announced that the agency had determined that the domestic sugar supply would be unable to fill 246,000 STRV of the OAQ and, in accordance with the statute, reassigned this deficit to imports. Hence, state allotments and company allocations were adjusted downward to reflect each company's and each state's ability to market its allocation and allotment.

The final 2005-crop (FY 2006) beet and cane sugar marketing allotments and allocations are listed in the following table:

FY 2006 OVERALL BEET/CANE ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOCATIONS

Distribution	FY 2006 Allotments/ allocations as of 3/22/06	Change due to reassignments	Final FY 2006 allotments/ allocations
Beet Sugar	4,839,725	−63,345	4,776,380
Cane Sugar	3,164,275	−182,655	2,981,620
WTO Raw Sugar Tariff Rate Quota (TRQ)[1]	670,000	75,000	745,000
Mexico TRQ Raw or Refined	276,000	0	276,000
Refined TRQ (global first-come, first-served)	400,000	109,921	509,921
FY 2006 Non Program Imports	0	61,079	61,079
Total OAQ	9,350,000	0	9,350,000
Beet Processors' Marketing Allocations:			
Amalgamated Sugar Co	1,158,015	−79,225	1,078,790
American Crystal Sugar Co	1,731,118	6,000	1,737,118
Michigan Sugar Co	467,030	3,984	471,014
Minn-Dak Farmers Co-op	279,237	4,085	283,322
So. Minn Beet Sugar Co-op	677,756	2,486	680,242
Western Sugar Co	473,047	462	473,509
Wyoming Sugar Co	53,521	−1,136	52,385
Total Beet Sugar	4,839,725	−63,345	4,776,380
State Cane Sugar Allotments:			
Florida	1,445,792	−78,164	1,367,628
Louisiana	1,273,054	−76,279	1,196,775
Texas	180,425	−4,095	176,330
Hawaii	265,003	−24,116	240,887
Puerto Rico	0	0	0
Total Cane Sugar	3,164,275	−182,655	2,981,620
Cane Processors' Marketing Allocations:			
Florida			
Florida Crystals	507,121	−11,388	495,733
Growers Co-op. of FL	265,129	−3,913	261,216
U.S. Sugar Corp	673,542	−62,863	610,679
Total	1,445,792	−78,164	1,367,628
Louisiana			
Alma Plantation	131,302	−3,141	128,161
Cajun Sugar Co-op	124,626	−10,892	113,734
Cora-Texas Mfg. Co	153,001	−13,707	139,294
Lafourche Sugars Corp	73,075	−1,527	71,548
Louisiana Sugarcane Co-op	94,036	−4,036	90,000
Lula Westfield, LLC	168,219	−5,177	163,043
M.A. Patout & Sons	345,197	−31,152	314,044
St. Mary Sugar Co-op	106,250	−2,100	104,150
So. Louisiana Sugars Co-op	77,347	−4,546	72,801
Total	1,273,054	−76,279	1,196,775
Texas			
Rio Grande Valley	180,425	−4,095	176,330
Hawaii			
Gay & Robinson, Inc	54,638	−2	54,636
Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company	210,366	−24,115	186,251
Total	265,003	−24,116	240,887

[1] 7/27/06 is for early entry FY07 raw sugar TRQ.

Initial FY 2007 State Allotments and Company Allocations

Section 359b(b)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(b)(1) requires the Secretary to establish, by the beginning of each crop year, an appropriate allotment for the marketing by processors of sugar processed from sugar beets and from domestically produced cane sugar at a level the Secretary estimates will result in no forfeitures of sugar to CCC under the loan program. When CCC announced the 8.750 million ton OAQ for FY 2007 in July 2006, it distributed 54.35 percent of the FY 2007 OAQ (4,755,625 STRV) to the beet sugar allotment. At that time, however, CCC determined that the cane sector would be unable to fill 375,000 STRV of its allotment and, hence, withheld this amount for reassignment to imports. Consequently, of the 45.65 percent of the OAQ statutorily allotted to the cane sector (3,994,375 STRV), only 3,619,375 STRV was allotted to cane states for allocation to sugarcane processors. Cane state allotments and processor allocations were announced by CCC on September 28, 2006.

To establish beet processor allocations, CCC applies the beet sector's allotment to fixed company allocation shares. Likewise, cane state and cane processor allocations are calculated by applying fixed shares to the cane sugar allotment. Allocation amounts will change only if CCC determines that a processor cannot fill its sugar allocation for the year and reassigns the unused allocation to other processors or if a sugarcane grower successfully transfers allocation commensurate with his production history to another processor. On September 28, 2006, CCC transferred a portion of Alma Plantation L.L.C.'s allocation to Cora Texas Manufacturing Company based on growers' petitions to transfer allocation when Alma closed its Cinclare factory.

CCC is required to limit the amount of sugarcane acreage that may be harvested in Louisiana for sugar or seed whenever marketing allotments are in effect and the quantity of sugarcane estimated to be produced in Louisiana, plus a reasonable carryover, exceeds the marketing allotment allocation for Louisiana. This limitation is referred to as a ''proportionate share,'' and is applied to each farm's sugarcane acreage base to determine the quantity of sugarcane that may be harvested on that farm. Because production is expected to be inadequate to fill Louisiana's FY 2007 allotment, CCC has determined that there will be no proportionate share restrictions for the 2006 crop year.

In FY 2004, CCC determined that Puerto Rico's processors permanently terminated operations because no sugar had been processed for two complete years. Consequently, the allocation of 6,356 STRV was permanently reassigned to the mainland cane-producing states. Hawaii received none of Puerto Rico's reassignment because it is not expected to use all of its current cane sugar allotment. A request for an allocation as a new entrant would be required for any mills in Puerto Rico to market cane sugar in the future.

The established 2006-crop (FY 2007) beet and cane sugar marketing allotments are listed in the following table:

FY 2007 OVERALL BEET/CANE ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOCATIONS

Distribution	Initial FY 2007 allotments/ allocations	Changes due to reassignments	Adjusted initial FY 2007 allotments/ allocations
Beet Sugar	4,755,625	0	4,755,625
Cane Sugar	3,994,375	−375,000	3,619,375
Reassignment to Imports	0	375,000	375,000
Total OAQ	8,750,000	0	8,750,000
Beet Processors' Marketing Allocations:			
Amalgamated Sugar Co	990,810	0	990,810
American Crystal Sugar Co	1,828,960	0	1,828,960
Michigan Sugar Co	477,920	0	477,920
Minn-Dak Farmers Co-op	296,690	0	296,690
So. Minn Beet Sugar Co-op	624,582	0	624,582
Western Sugar Co	473,221	0	473,221
Wyoming Sugar Co	63,441	0	63,441
Total Beet Sugar	4,755,625	0	4,755,625
State Cane Sugar Allotments:			
Florida	1,975,622	−213,359	1,762,263
Louisiana	1,528,365	−143,141	1,385,224
Texas	171,744	28,680	200,424
Hawaii	318,644	−47,179	271,465
Total Cane Sugar	3,994,375	−375,000	3,619,375
Cane Processors' Marketing Allocations:			
Florida			
Florida Crystals	813,415	−128,606	684,809
Growers Co-op. of FL	355,385	−45,052	310,334
U.S. Sugar Corp	806,821	−39,701	767,120
Total	1,975,622	−213,359	1,762,263
Louisiana			
Alma Plantation	127,988	−7,199	120,789
Cajun Sugar Co-op	154,543	−28,052	126,491
Cora-Texas Mfg. Co	159,455	14,258	173,712
Lafourche Sugars Corp	83,245	115	83,359
Louisiana Sugarcane Co-op	117,521	−13,867	103,654
Lula Westfield, LLC	180,483	10,756	191,239
M.A. Patout & Sons	429,373	−15,647	413,726
St. Mary Sugar Co-op	155,667	−43,313	112,354
So. Louisiana Sugars Co-op	120,091	−60,191	59,900
Total	1,528,365	−143,141	1,385,224
Texas			
Rio Grande Valley	171,744	28,680	200,424
Hawaii			
Gay & Robinson, Inc	73,145	−25,618	47,527
Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company	245,499	−21,561	223,938

FY 2007 OVERALL BEET/CANE ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOCATIONS—Continued

Distribution	Initial FY 2007 allotments/ allocations	Changes due to reassign-ments	Adjusted initial FY 2007 allotments/ allocations
Total	318,644	−47,179	271,465

Signed in Washington, DC, on November 2, 2006.

Teresa C. Lasseter,

Executive Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation.

[FR Doc. E6–19077 Filed 11–9–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Extension of Certain Timber Sale Contracts; Finding of Substantial Overriding Public Interest

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of contract extensions.

SUMMARY: On November 2, 2006, the Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment determined there is substantial overriding public interest in extending certain National Forest System timber sale contracts for up to one year, subject to a maximum total contract length of 10 years. Pursuant to the November 2, 2006, finding, timber sale contracts awarded prior to January 1, 2006, are eligible for extension and deferral of periodic payment due dates for up to one year. Contracts that are in breach, have been or are currently eligible to be extended under market related contract term addition contract provisions, or salvage sale contracts that were sold with the objective of harvesting deteriorating timber are not eligible for extension pursuant to the November 2, 2006, finding. To receive an extension, purchasers must make a written request to the appropriate Contracting Officer. Purchasers also must agree to release the Forest Service from all claims and liability if a contract extended pursuant to the November 2, 2006, finding is suspended, modified or terminated in the future.

The intended effect of the substantial overriding public interest finding and contract extensions is to minimize contract defaults, mill closures, and company bankruptcies. The Government benefits if defaulted timber sale contracts, mill closures, and bankruptcies can be avoided by granting extensions. Having numerous, economically viable, timber sale purchasers increases competition for National Forest System timber sales, results in higher prices paid for such timber, and allows the Forest Service to provide a continuous supply of timber to the public in accordance with Forest Service authorizing legislation. See Act of June 4, 1897 (Ch. 2, 30 Stat. 11 as amended, 16 U.S.C. 475) (Organic Administration Act). In addition, by extending contracts and avoiding defaults, closures and bankruptcies, the Government avoids the difficult, lengthy, expensive, and sometimes impossible process of collecting default damages.

DATES: The determination was made on November 2, 2006, by the Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lathrop Smith, Forest Management Staff, (202) 205–0858 or Richard Fitzgerald, Forest Management Staff (202) 205–1753; 1400 Independence Ave., SW., Mailstop 1103, Washington, DC 20250–1103.

Individuals who use telecommunication devices for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Forest Service sells timber and forest products from National Forest System lands to individuals or companies pursuant to the National Forest Management Act of 1976, 16 U.S.C. 472a (NFMA). Each sale is formalized by execution of a contract between the purchaser and the Forest Service. The contract sets forth the explicit terms and provisions of the sale, including such matters as the estimated volume of timber to be removed, the period for removal, price to be paid to the Government, road construction and logging requirements, and environmental protection measures to be taken. The average contract period is approximately 2–3 years, although a few contracts have terms of 5 or more years.

Rules at 36 CFR 223.52 (Market Related Contract Term Additions) permit contract extensions when the Chief of the Forest Service determines that adverse wood product market conditions have resulted in a drastic decline in wood product prices. Under market-related contract addition procedures, the Forest Service refers to the following three producer price indices maintained by the Bureau of Labor Statistics: Softwood Lumber #0811 and Hardwood Lumber #0812 in the Commodity Series, and Wood Chips #PCU32113321135 in the Industry Series.

The softwood and hardwood lumber indices indicate a major downturn in those markets began about September 2004 and was still on a downward trend as of September 2006 with the softwood lumber index decreasing by about 31% and the hardwood lumber index decreasing by about 14% during this time. While most purchasers holding contracts with those indices have received or are eligible to receive market related contract term additions, an anomoly in the wood products markets and indices used in contracts in the lake States area and some other parts of the country has left many purchasers without this remedy.

Section 472a(c) of NFMA provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall not extend any timber sale contract period with an original term of two years or more, unless the purchaser has diligently performed in accordance with an approved plan of operations or the ''substantial overriding public interest'' justifies the extension. The authority to make this determination has been delegated to the Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment at 7 CFR 2.59.

Accordingly, based on a current study, the Deputy Under Secretary has made a finding that there is a substantial overriding public interest in extending certain sales for up to one year. This determination does not apply to contracts that were previously extended or that are currently eligible to be extended under market related contract term addition provisions, to salvage sale contracts that were sold with the objective of harvesting deteriorating timber, or to timber sale contracts that are in breach. In addition to extending contracts pursuant to the Deputy Under Secretary's finding, periodic payments will be deferred for up to one year on the extended sales. To receive an extension and periodic payment deferral, purchasers must make a