

environmental review process. First, reviewers of the DEIS 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 are not raised until after completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) 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 two-month comment period so that substantive comments and objectives are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the FEIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed actions, comments on the DEIS 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 DEIS or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statements. 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.

After the comment period ends on the DEIS, comments will be analyzed, considered, and responded to by the Forest Service in preparing the FEIS. The FEIS is scheduled to be completed in the Fall of 2000. The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, and environmental consequences discussed in the FEIS, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making decisions regarding making the revisions and amendment. The responsible official will document the decisions and reasons for the decisions in a Record of Decision for the revised and amended plans. The decisions will be subject to appeal in accordance with 36 CFR part 217.

Dated: April 16, 1998.

Jack A. Blackwell,

Regional Forester.

[FR Doc. 98-10782 Filed 4-23-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Modoc National Forest Noxious Weed Control Project

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement to eradicate between 100 and 300 acres of noxious weeds annually, beginning 1999 for a period of 10 to 20 years, within site specific areas of the Modoc, Lassen, and Siskiyou Counties in northeastern California. The proposed 26 target weeds are Plumeless thistle, Musk thistle, Canada thistle, Yellowspine thistle, Scotch thistle, Russian knapweed, Rush skeletonweed, Diffuse knapweed, Spotted knapweed, Yellow starthistle, Hoary cress or whitetop, Squarrose knapweed, Marlahan mustard, Leafy spurge, Halogeton, St. Johnswort, Dalmation toadflax, Purple loosestrife, Mediterranean sage, Puncture vine, Perennial pepperweed, Medusahead, Jointed goatgrass, Barbed goatgrass, Common crupina, and Wavyleaf thistle. The proposed treatment methods are mechanical, biological, cultural, preventive, chemical, and through land management practices such as livestock grazing. The herbicides which will be used are chloraulfuron, dicamba, clopyralid, 2,4-D, picloram, hexazinone, glyphosate, triclopyr, sulfometuron methyl, and simazine. The proposed herbicides are distributed under a number of trade names and strengths. The agency invites written comments and suggestions on the proposed project.

In preparing the environmental impact statement, the Forest Service will identify and consider a range of alternatives. Possible alternatives to this proposal are no action, utilize all treatments except aerial, and all treatments except chemical.

DATES: Comments concerning the proposal should be received in writing by May 25, 1998, to receive timely consideration in the preparation of the draft EIS. The draft EIS will be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review in August 1998. The final EIS and Record of Decision are expected to be issued in November 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments and suggestions concerning the scope of the analysis to Steven F. Bishop, Acting Forest Supervisor, Modoc National

Forest, 800 West 12th Street, Alturas, CA 96101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Direct questions about the proposed action and environmental impact statement to Jim Irvin, or Allison Sanger, Project Leader, Modoc National Forest, 800 West 12th Street, Alturas, CA 96101, 530-233-5811.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: There are 26 noxious weed species which receiving intensive control in or near the Modoc National Forest. Thirteen of the 26 species are listed as "A" rated weed pests which means they have limited distribution in California and are subject to eradication, quarantine, or other holding actions at the State and County levels. All 26 of these are exotic pests, not native to California and thus replace the native species then they invade different plant communities.

In 1997, approximately 90 acres of noxious weeds were treated on the Modoc National Forest in Modoc, Lassen, and Siskiyou Counties. Infestations are scattered primarily over Lassen and Modoc Counties, the largest being the common crupina infestation above Round Valley which covers a total of 740 acres of private and Forest Service lands. Most infestations are less than one acre in size.

An Integrated Weed Pest Management approach will be used to control and eradicate these weeds species. This approach uses a combination of control methods which include; mechanical control such as hand pulling, clipping, mowing, and burning of weeds; cultural control such as fertilization, seeding, and cultivation; biological control through the use of parasites and pathogens; preventive through the use of education and guidelines to increase awareness and prevent new infestations onto Forest lands; chemical control through the use of herbicides; and control by land management practices such as livestock grazing.

Chemical methods include the use of backpack sprayers, truck mounted power sprayers, or aerial application of a specific area only. The chemicals (herbicides) would be in either liquid or granular form. Helicopters are used for aerial application to minimize resource damage in areas with limited access, and large infestations. To obtain the greatest reduction of weeds from chemical control, selection of the proper herbicide with application at the proper time and method are of the utmost importance.

Aerial application is being proposed for only one area on the Forest, a 160 acre (740 acre total) infestation of common crupina found on private and

Forest Service lands in the northeastern corner of Round Valley. This will be a one-time aerial application of herbicides with follow-up by ground treatment. No other aerial application of herbicides will be analyzed in this document.

Public participation is especially important at several points during the analysis. The first point is during the scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7). The Forest Service will be seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, and local agencies and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in or affected by the proposed action. This input will be used in preparation of the draft environmental impact Statement (DEIS). The scoping process includes:

1. Identifying potential issues.
2. Identifying issues to be analyzed in depth.
3. Eliminating insignificant issues or those which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental analysis.
4. Exploring additional alternatives.
5. Identifying potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternatives (i.e., direct, indirect, cumulative effects and connected actions).

The Modoc County Agriculture Department will be invited to participate as a cooperating agency to supervise the eradication of this weed.

The DEIS is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review in August 1998. The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the EPA 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 at 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 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.

After the comment period ends on the draft EIS, the comments will be analyzed and considered by the Forest Service in preparing the final environmental impact statement. In the final EIS the Forest Service is required to respond to the comments received (40 CFR 1503.4). The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, environmental consequences discussed in the EIS, and applicable laws, regulation, and policies in making a decision.

Dated: April 9, 1998.

Stephen F. Bishop,

Acting Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 98-10954 Filed 4-23-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-32-P

UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The Director's Advisory Committee; Notice of Closed Meetings

April 21, 1998.

In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2 § 10(a)(2) (1996), the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) announces the following Advisory Committee meetings:

Name: The Director's Advisory Committee (DirAC).

Dates: May 11-12, 1998, June 8-9, 1998.

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Place: For the May meeting: Offutt Air Force Base Omaha, Nebraska. For the June meeting: State Department Building, 320 21st Street, N.W. Room 4930 Washington, D.C.

Type Of Meetings: Closed.

Contact: Robert Sherman, Executive Director, Director's Advisory Committee,

Room 5844, Washington, D.C. 20451, (202) 647-4622.

Purpose of Advisory: To advise the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency respecting scientific, technical, and policy matters affecting arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament.

Purpose of the Meetings: The Committee will review specific arms control, nonproliferation, and verification issues. Members will be briefed on current U.S. policy and issues regarding agreements including the START II Treaty, Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Convention on Conventional Weapons. Members will exchange information and concepts with key ACDA personnel. All meetings will be held in Executive Session.

Reason for Closing: The DirAC members will be reviewing and discussing matters specifically authorized by Executive Order 12,958 to be kept secret in the interest of national defense and foreign policy.

Authority to Close Meetings: The closing of the meetings is in accordance with a determination by the Acting Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency dated April 21, 1998, made pursuant to the provisions of Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2 § 10(d) (1996).

Nancy Aderholdt,

Acting Director of Administration.

April 21, 1998.

Determination To Close Meetings of the Director's Advisory Committee

The Director's Advisory Committee (DirAC) will hold meetings in Omaha, Nebraska, on May 11-12, and Washington, D.C., on June 8-9, 1998.

The entire agenda of these meetings will be devoted to specific national security policy and arms control issues. In accordance with section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2 § 10(d) (1996), I have determined that the meetings may be closed to the public in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c)(1) (1996). Materials to be discussed at the meetings have been properly classified, and are specifically authorized under criteria established by Executive Order 12,958, 60 Fed. Reg. 19,825 (1995), to be kept secret in the interests of national defense and foreign policy.

Ralph Earle, II,

Acting.

[FR Doc. 98-11095 Filed 4-22-98; 11:22 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-32-M

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

Procurement List; Proposed Additions

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

ACTION: Proposed additions to Procurement List.