# **Notices**

Federal Register

Vol. 61, No. 169

Thursday, August 29, 1996

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

#### **DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. 96-059-1]

### Availability of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

**AGENCY:** Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: We are advising the public that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has prepared an environmental assessment and a finding of no significant impact for the field testing of an unlicensed veterinary biological product. A risk analysis, which forms the basis for the environmental assessment, has led us to conclude that field testing this unlicensed veterinary biological product will not have a significant impact on the

quality of the human environment. Based on our finding of no significant impact, we have determined that an environmental impact statement need not be prepared.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact may be obtained by writing to the person listed under FOR FURTHER **INFORMATION CONTACT.** Please refer to the docket number and publication date of this notice, as well as the first two words of the product name, when requesting copies. Copies of the environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact (as well as the risk analysis with confidential business information removed) are also available for public inspection at USDA, room 1141, South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Persons wishing to inspect those documents are requested to call ahead on (202) 690-2817 to facilitate entry into the reading room. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Jeanette Greenberg, Veterinary Biologics, BBEP, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 148, Riverdale, MD 20737-1237; telephone (301) 734-8400; fax (301) 734–8910; or E-mail:

jgreenberg@aphis.usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Virus-Serum-Toxin Act (21 U.S.C. 151

et seq.), a veterinary biological product must be shown to be pure, safe, potent, and efficacious before a veterinary biological product license may be issued. A field test is generally necessary to satisfy prelicensing requirements for veterinary biological products. In order to ship an unlicensed veterinary biological product for the purpose of conducting a proposed field test, a person must receive authorization from the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS).

In determining whether to authorize shipment for field testing the unlicensed veterinary biological product referenced in this notice, APHIS conducted a risk analysis to assess the potential effect of this product on the safety of animals, public health, and the environment. Based on that risk analysis, APHIS has prepared an environmental assessment. APHIS has concluded that field testing this unlicensed veterinary biological product will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Based on this finding of no significant impact, we have determined that there is no need to prepare an environmental impact statement.

An environmental assessment and a finding of no significant impact have been prepared for field testing the following unlicensed veterinary biological product:

Requester	Product	Field test locations					
Oxford Veterinary Laboratories, Inc	Feline Rhinotracheitis Vaccine, Modified Live Virus	California, braska.	Colorado,	Illinois,	Iowa,	Kansas,	Ne-

The environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact have been prepared in accordance with: (1) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), (2) Regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), (3) USDA regulations implementing NEPA (7 CFR part 1b), and (4) APHIS' NEPA Implementing Procedures (7 CFR part 372).

Unless substantial environmental issues are raised in response to this notice, APHIS intends to authorize the shipment of the above product and the initiation of the field tests on September 12, 1996.

Done in Washington, DC, this 22nd day of August 1996.

A. Strating

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 96–22108 Filed 8–28–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

[Docket No. 96-064-2]

# Procedures for Importing Animals Through the Harry S. Truman Animal Import Center

**AGENCY:** Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice; Correction.

**SUMMARY:** The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service is correcting the telephone number of the person listed under for further information contact in a notice that was published in the Federal Register on August 23, 1996 (61 FR 43521). The notice announced the date and location of the lottery for authorization of the use of the Harry S Truman Animal Import Center in calendar year 1997, and also the period during which applications must be received to be included in the lottery.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Joan Montgomery, Staff Specialist, Import-Export Animals Staff, National Center for Import-Export, VS, APHIS, Suite 3B30, 4700 River Road Unit 39,

Riverdale, MD 20737–1231, (301) 734–8364.

Done in Washington, DC, this 23rd day of August 1996.

Richard R. Kelly,

Acting Chief, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 96–22035 Filed 8–28–96; 8:45 am]

#### Natural Resources Conservation Service

#### Finding of No Significant Impact for Limestone-Graveyard Creeks Watershed Bent and Prowers Counties, CO

#### Introduction

The Limestone-Graveyard Creeks Watershed is a federally assisted action authorized for planning under Pubic Law 83-566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. An environmental assessment was undertaken in conjunction with the development of the watershed plan. This assessment was conducted in consultation with local, state, and federal agencies as well as with interested organization and individuals. Data developed during the assessment are available for public review at the following location: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, 655 Parfet Street, Suite E200C, Lakewood, CO 80215-5517.

#### Recommended Action

The recommended plan is composed of management and enduring conservation practices to reduce deep percolation, runoff and irrigation induced erosion which will improve water quality of both surface and groundwater, the Arkansas river, as well as protect the resource base.

It is expected that 108 long-term land treatment contracts will be written during the project's life. Approximately 26,700 acres will be treated through

project action.

The primary purposes are: (1) (Watershed protection)—protect the soil resource base from excessive irrigation induced erosion and sedimentation and reduce negative water quality impacts to surface and groundwater, including the Arkansas River from selenium, sediment, salts, and nitrate loading, (2) (Agricultural water management)—improve application unformity.

#### Effects of Recommended Action

Overall improved surface and groundwater quality, improved human

health and safety, significant sediment and erosion reduction, improved water quality in the Arkansas River, improved wetlands and fisheries from improved water quality, improved wildlife habitat, reduced irrigation labor costs, reduced irrigation system operation and maintenance, and improved irrigation systems and management results in increased available water supply on and offsite.

The proposed action will reduce selenium, sediments, salts, nitrates, and other pollutants, in ground water and the Arkansas River, thereby improving the water quality. It will also protect the watershed resource base by reducing irrigation induced erosion.

Significant negative effects to wetlands are not expected. However, if mitigation is necessary, it will be accomplished on a value for value basis.

A slight improvement of the upland wildlife habitat is expected due to an increase in forage and water quality.

The proposed project will encourage and promote the agricultural enterprises in the watershed through education and accelerated technical and financial assistance. This will help maintain agriculture as a significant component in the area economy.

A list of the cultural resource sites within the watershed has been obtained from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Their relationship to planned conservation measures was evaluated. The survey concludes that no significant adverse impacts will occur to known cultural resources in the watershed should the plan be implemented. If however, during construction of enduring measures a new site is identified, construction will stop and the (SHPO) will be notified.

There is no wilderness areas in the watershed.

There are no threatened or endangered species known to exist in the watershed. However, prairie dog towns which could provide habitat for the black-footed ferret, will not be disturbed during project action.

As stated above, the primary objective of the project is to reduce the selenium entering the Arkansas River and groundwater. Land treatment measures will reduce selenium levels to within State and EPA standards.

Wildlife habitat may be temporarily disturbed in areas where enduring measures are implemented. They will however, return to at least their previous value within a short period of time.

The fishery in the Arkansas River will be impacted to a lesser degree by selenium after the project is complete. No significant adverse environmental impacts will result from the installation of conservation measures. Some short-term habitat disturbances may occur during construction of small erosion control structures, but they will heal quickly.

#### Alternatives

The planned action is the most practical means of reducing the selenium, salts, and sediment entering the Arkansas River and groundwater, thus protecting the resource base in the watershed. Since no significant adverse environmental impacts will result from installation of the measures and no other alternatives could meet the tests of completeness, effectiveness, efficiency, and acceptability, this alternative becomes the only viable candidate plan. The no action alternative was used for comparison purposes.

## Consultation—Public Participation

The Bent and Prowers Soil Conservation Districts requested in March, 1989, that the watershed be considered for a PL566 watershed project. A field review was made on March 23, 1989. The review team found that significant irrigation water management, water quality, and watershed protection treatment was needed. The Soil Conservation District and the NRCS Field Office decided that detailed information collection would be the first priority. Data on water quantity, quality, and practice needs were gathered. Ninety percent of the landowners expressed an interest in this project. Significant resource problems were found and the sponsors made an application for PL566 planning assistance June 16, 1989.

The State Soil Conservation Board formally accepted the application on September 6, 1989. The Soil Conservation Services' West National Technical Center (WNTC) made a field reconnaissance October 25, 1989. They met with the irrigation company personnel, field offices, and conservation district officials. It was decided further data was needed to quantify the off-site effects from project action. In January 1993, the NRCS Field Office, area staff and state staff developed a schedule to complete a preauthorization plan and plan of work.

On June 24, 1993, a public scoping meeting was held to discuss the problems, needs, and possible effects from a project. Federal, State, and local agencies, and the general public were invited. This group helped give direction to the NRCS planners. A public response analysis was completed