

information and comments from Federal, State, and local agencies and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in or affected by the proposed action. A scoping document will be prepared and mailed to parties known to be interested in the proposed action. The agency invites written comments and suggestions on this action, particularly in terms of issues and alternatives. The Forest Service will continue to involve the public and will inform interested and affected parties as to how they may participate and contribute to the final decision.

The draft EIS should be available for review in May, 1998. The final EIS is scheduled for completion in September, 1998.

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 it is important, at this early stage, 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 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 environmental impact statement stage but 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 those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45-day comment period so 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 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.

Dated: December 3, 1996.

Charles C. Wildes,

Forest Supervisor, Lolo National Forest.

[FR Doc. 96-32293 Filed 12-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

### **Dome Peak Timber Sale Analysis, White River National Forest; Routt County, CO**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement to disclose effects of alternative decisions it may make to harvest dead Engelmann spruce and associated road construction within the Dome Peak Timber Sale planning area, on the Eagle Ranger District of the White River National Forest.

**DATES:** Written comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be received on or before March 1, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Veto J. LaSalle, Forest Supervisor, White River National Forest, P.O. Box 948, 9th and Grand Ave., Glenwood Springs, Colorado 81602. Mr. LaSalle is the Responsible Official for this EIS.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Van Norman, Project Coordinator, Holy Cross Ranger District, 24747 U.S. Highway 24, P.O. Box 190, Minturn, CO 81645, (970) 827-5715.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On October 28, 1996 the White River National Forest released a Draft Environmental Assessment for the proposed action and alternatives to that proposed action under Public Law 104-19. Based on comments received from members of the public, the Interdisciplinary Team has determined that the proposed action and alternatives to that action represent a roadless area entry. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is required as per Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, Section 20.6. The proposed action proposes to harvest approximately 2.5 million board feet from approximately 650 acres of dead Engelmann spruce using a combination of ground-based and helicopter yarding and to construct approximately 1.1 miles of new specified road.

The proposed action is consistent with governing programmatic

management direction contained in the *Rocky Mountain Regional Guide* and FEIS for Standards and Guidelines (1983) and in the Final EIS and *Land and Resource Management Plan for the White River National Forest* (LMP, 1984). The LMP allocated the proposed timber sale area to semi-primitive non-motorized use and allows for timber harvest. The site-specific environmental analysis provided by the EIS will assist the Responsible Official in determining which improvements are needed to meet the following objectives: Reduce natural fuel loadings and to provide wood products for the nation and opportunities for timber related jobs. Alternatives will be carefully examined for their potential impacts on the physical, biological, and social environments so that tradeoffs are apparent to the decisionmaker.

*Public participation* will be fully incorporated into preparation of the EIS. The first step is the scoping process, during which the Forest Service will be seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, and local agencies, and other individuals or groups who may be interested or affected by the proposed action. This information will be used in preparing the EIS. No public meetings are planned for this project. Public comments received during initial scoping and those raised during public review of the Draft Environmental Assessment for this project will be incorporated into this EIS. Individuals who have provided comments during initial scoping, on the Draft Environmental Assessment, and those who provide comments on this EIS will receive copies of the Draft EIS for their review.

*Preliminary issues* include the potential effects of proposed actions on the following elements of the biological, physical and social environments: Wildlife habitat, and overall biological diversity; wetlands and riparian areas; scenic quality; air quality; roadless area resource values; recreation resource values, range resource values, and social and economic values. The direct, indirect, cumulative, short-term, and long-term aspects of impacts on national forest lands and resources, and those of connected or related effects off-site, will be fully disclosed.

*Preliminary alternatives* include the proposed action (described above) and No Action, which in this case is deferring treatment of the area until the future. A third preliminary alternative will be analyzed which would harvest approximately 0.4 million board feet of dead Engelmann spruce from approximately 100 acres using ground-based yarding and to construct

approximately 1.1 miles of new specified road. Additional alternatives may be developed after the significant issues are clarified and management objectives are fully defined. The Responsible Official will be presented with a range of feasible and practical alternatives.

*Permits and licenses* required to implement the proposed action will, or may, include the following: consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for compliance with Section 7 of the Threatened & Endangered Species Act; review from the Colorado Division of Wildlife, and clearance from the Colorado State Historic Preservation Office.

The Forest Service predicts the draft environmental impact statement will be filed during the spring of 1997 and the final environmental impact statement during the summer of 1997.

The Forest Service will seek comments on the draft environmental impact statement for a period of 45 days after its publication in the Federal Register. Comments will then be summarized and responded to 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 environmental impact 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.)

The Forest Service believes it is important to give reviewers notice at this early stage of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of the draft environmental impact statement 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 DEIS stage but that are not raised until after completion of the Final EIS 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 they 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 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.

Dated: December 13, 1996.

Ben DeVillar,

*Deputy Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 96-32342 Filed 12-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-BW-M

#### **Klamath Provincial Advisory Committee (PAC)**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Klamath Provincial Advisory Committee will meet on January 30 and January 31, 1996 at the Red Lion Hotel, Sacramento Room, 1830 Hilltop Drive, Redding, California. The meeting will begin at 9:00 a.m. on January 30 and adjourn at 5:00 p.m. The meeting will reconvene at 8:00 a.m. on January 31 and continue until 3:00 p.m. Agenda items to be covered include: (1) example of Province-wide data application to PAC decision making process; (2) a strategy plan for the next two years of PAC Charter with recommendations; (3) a presentation on the proposed Pelican Butte Ski Area; (4) Province Interagency Executive Committee Report; and (5) public comment periods. All PAC meetings are open to the public. Interested citizens are encouraged to attend.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Connie Hendryx, USDA, Klamath National Forest, at 1312 Fairlane Road, Yreka, California 96097; telephone 916-842-6131, (FTS) 700-467-1309.

Dated: December 11, 1996.

Jay H. Perkins,

*Deputy Fire Staff Officer.*

[FR Doc. 96-32344 Filed 12-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

#### **Natural Resources Conservation Service**

##### **Upper Tioga River Watershed, Pennsylvania; Notice of Deauthorization of Federal Funding**

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 83-566, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service (formerly the Soil Conservation Service) Guidelines (7 CFR Part 622); the Natural Resources Conservation Service (formerly the Soil Conservation Service) gives notice of the deauthorization of Federal funding for the Upper Tioga River Watershed project, Tioga and Bradford Counties, Pennsylvania, effective on November 26, 1996.

##### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Ms. Janet L. Oertly, State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Suite 340, One Credit Union Place, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110-2993, telephone (717) 782-2202.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 10.904, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention. Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-95 regarding State and local clearinghouse review of Federal and federally-assisted programs and projects is applicable.)

Dated: December 17, 1996.

Janet L. Oertly,

*State Conservationist.*

[FR Doc. 96-32308 Filed 12-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-16-M

#### **Rural Utilities Service**

##### **Marshall's Energy Company, Inc.; Finding of No Significant Impact**

**AGENCY:** Rural Utilities Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of finding of no significant impact.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the Rural Utilities Service (RUS), pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and RUS Environmental Policies and Procedures (7 CFR Part 1794), has made a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) with respect to a project proposed by the Marshall's Energy Company, Inc. (MEC), of the Republic of the Marshall Islands. The proposed