

vote on amendments or continuance of the marketing order. In addition, winter pear growers and handlers who are nominated by their peers to serve as representatives on the WPCC must file nomination forms with the Secretary.

These forms require the minimum information necessary to effectively carry out the requirements of the order, and their use is necessary to fulfill the intent of the AMAA as expressed in the order.

The information collected is used only by authorized representatives of the USDA, including AMS, Fruit and Vegetable Programs regional and headquarter's staff, and authorized employees of the WPCC. Authorized WPCC employees and the industry are the primary users of the information and AMS is the secondary user.

*Estimate of Burden:* Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.764 hours per response.

*Respondents:* Winter pear producers and for-profit businesses handling fresh winter pears produced in Oregon and Washington.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 1,890.

*Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent:* 1.8873

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 3,567 hours.

*Comments are invited on:* (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments should reference OMB No. 0581-0080 and California Peach Marketing Order No. 917; and OMB No. 0581-0089 and the Winter Pear Marketing Order No. 927, and be mailed to Docket Clerk, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, AMS, USDA, Post Office Box 96456, Room 2525-S, Washington, DC 20090-6456; Fax: (202) 720-5698; or E-mail: moabdocket\_clerk@usda.gov. All comments received will be available for public inspection during regular business hours at the same address.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: November 4, 1999.

**Robert C. Keeney,**

*Deputy Administrator, Fruit and Vegetable Programs.*

[FR Doc. 99-29488 Filed 11-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### **Revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan for the Bighorn National Forest located in Sheridan, Johnson, Big Horn, and Washakie Counties, Wyoming**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement in conjunction with revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan for the Bighorn National Forest.

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement in conjunction with the revision of its Land and Resource Management Plan (hereafter referred to as Forest Plan or Plan) for the Bighorn National Forest.

This notice describes the proposed action, specific portions of the current Forest Plan to be revised, environmental issues considered in the revision, estimated dates for filing the environmental impact statement, information concerning public participation, and the names and addresses of the agency officials who can provide additional information.

**DATES:** The public is asked to provide comments identifying and considering issues, concerns, and the scope of analysis with regard to the proposed action, in writing by January 31, 2000. The Forest Service expects to file a Draft Environmental Impact Statement with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and make it available for public comment in February of 2001. The Forest Service expects to file a Final Environmental Impact Statement in February of 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to: Abigail R. Kimbell, Forest Supervisor, Bighorn National Forest, 1969 South Sheridan Avenue, Sheridan, Wyoming 82801.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bob Daniels, Forest Planner, (307 672-0751) or Joel Strong, Alternate Planning Team Leader (307 672-0751).

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:** Rocky Mountain Regional Forester at P.O. Box 25127, Lakewood, CO 80225-0127.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to Part 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 219.10(g), the Regional Forester for the Rocky Mountain Region gives notice of the agency's intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for the revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan (hereafter referred to as Forest Plan or Plan) for the Bighorn National Forest. According to 36 CFR 219.10(g), land and resource management plans are ordinarily revised on a 10 to 15 year cycle. The existing Forest Plan was approved on October 4, 1985.

The United States has a unique legal relationship with Native American tribal governments as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, treaties, statutes, Executive orders and Court decisions. The Forest Service will establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with the tribal nations on a government to government basis.

Forest plans describe the intended management of National Forests. Agency decisions in these plans do the following:

1. Establish multiple-use goals and objectives (36 CFR 219.11(b)).
2. Establish forestwide management standards and guidelines applying to future activities (resource integration requirements, 36 CFR 219.13 to 219.27).
3. Establish management areas and management area direction (management area prescriptions) applying to future activities in that management area (resource integration and minimum specific management requirements) 36 CFR 219.11(c).
4. Establish monitoring and evaluation requirements (36 CFR 219.11(d)).
5. Determine suitability and potential capability of lands for resource production. This includes designation of suitable timber land and establishment of allowable timber sale quantity (36 CFR 219.14 through 219.26).
6. Where applicable, recommend designations of special areas such as Wilderness (36 CFR 219.17) and Wild and Scenic Rivers (The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act) to Congress.

#### **Need for Change In The Current Forest Plan**

Since our existing Forest Plan was approved in 1985, experience in implementing the plan and monitoring the effects of that implementation indicates that we need to make some changes in management direction.

Several other sources have also highlighted the need for changes in the current Forest Plan. These sources include:

- Public involvement which has identified new information, issues and public values.
- Monitoring and scientific research which have identified new information and knowledge gained.
- Forest plan implementation which has identified management concerns, particularly, the inability of current standards and guidelines to be met while providing projected outputs of forest products in our existing plan.
- New Management Area (MA)

Prescriptions have been developed since the 1985 Plan was approved. These need to be adapted with goals and objectives clearly defined. Management Area boundaries need to be evaluated and mapped.

### Preparing the Plan and EIS

An interdisciplinary team is conducting the environmental analysis and will prepare an environmental impact statement associated with revision of the Forest Plan. This interdisciplinary team will also prepare the revised Forest Plan. As part of this effort, the interdisciplinary team will develop a list of forestwide standards and guidelines; identify draft management areas; and develop the corresponding management area themes, settings, desired condition statements, and management area-specific standards and guidelines. These will then be used to develop alternatives to the proposed action for the revised Forest Plan.

### The Proposed Action

#### Major Revision Topics

We have identified the following five major revision topics through annual Forest Plan monitoring reports, review of regulations, internal Forest Service discussions, and discussions with the public:

- Biological Diversity
- Timber Suitability and Management of Forested Lands
- Roadless Area Allocation and Management
- Special Areas
- Travel Dispersed and Recreation Management

The topics represent areas where we identified a significant need for change (discussed above) or where regulations require analysis. There will also be secondary revision topics that are also important issues, however they are not likely substantial or widespread enough to be major drivers in the alternative

themes. Management of riparian lands on the Forest, elk security, and designation of areas appropriate for utility lines and hydro electric power production are examples of other issues that will be addressed.

The Forest Service has recently adopted a new resource agenda. This new approach, A Natural Resource Agenda for the 21st Century, will be the foundation for National Forest Management into the 21st century.

There are four key elements in the agenda:

- (1) Watershed health and restoration
- (2) Sustainable forest ecosystem management
- (3) Forest Roads
- (4) Recreation

Another important development was passage of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) which was passed in 1993. This act directs the preparation of periodic strategic plans by federal agencies. The First Strategic Plan for the Forest Service written in 1997, focuses on three goals:

- (1) Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems
- (2) Provide Multiple Benefits for People Within the Capabilities of Ecosystems
- (3) Ensure Organizational Effectiveness

The revised Land and Resource Management Plan for the Bighorn National Forest will be built on principles of integrated ecosystem management. This approach will address many of the concerns and monitoring recommendations identified with the 1985 Plan.

Watershed health, and restoration will be important components of the analysis and Plan. Sustainable forest ecosystems and forest roads will also be important considerations as the Plan is revised. Finally, recreation will be featured in the special area and travel management revision topics.

The Revised Forest Plan will include a monitoring strategy to measure how effectively the Plan meets stated goals and objectives. In keeping with GPRA and the Natural Resource Agenda, this strategy will focus on outcomes and desired resource conditions rather than outputs.

As part of the proposed action, the following changes are suggested for each of the revision topics:

#### Biological Diversity

Current Direction: In the current Plan is intended to produce a diversity of habitats well-distributed throughout the landscape. This approach to managing biological diversity produces a very heterogeneous landscape at a fine scale. Patches are small, with a high percentage of edge habitat. Patches are

areas where the vegetation is similar in species, age, and size. Natural disturbance processes are generally controlled or suppressed. All habitats, including late successional forests are well distributed but in generally small patches. The current plan contains two Research Natural Area which feature biological diversity related features.

Need for Revision: The following concerns with biological diversity have been identified from monitoring and public scoping and indicate a need for change.

- Public interest in biological diversity and how best to maintain it has grown substantially since the Forest Plan was approved over a decade ago.
- Biological diversity or various aspects of it (such as threatened, endangered, and sensitive species management and forest health) have been significant issues in environmental analyses in recent years. The current plan's emphasis on heterogeneous habitats and exclusion of natural disturbance events has caused concerns about sustainability of the forested ecosystems.

Direction in the current plan does not fully reflect the latest scientific information on land management planning. This new information needs to be incorporated into the revised plan, particularly the principles of ecosystem management, with attention given to managing on more of a landscape scale.

Proposed Action: The proposed action is based on monitoring, preliminary analysis, and public input and includes the following actions which will be disclosed in one or more of the draft EIS alternatives:

- Allocating larger blocks of roadless areas to prescriptions with an emphasis on late successional forests and natural disturbance processes.
- Emulating natural landscape patch size in many areas where timber harvest is allowed.
- Increased use of prescribed fire both within and outside of Wilderness through natural and human ignitions.
- Aggressive treatment of noxious weed populations through various means, including mechanical, biological and chemical control.
- Exclude or modify some existing uses to better protect species at risk and to maintain or improve species viability and biological diversity.

#### Timber Suitability and Management of Forested Lands

Current Direction: Currently the Forest Plan allocates approximately 92% of the tentatively suited lands in management area prescriptions to timber management. Timber

management is practiced across these management areas, with differing management emphases and intentions. The current Plan originally set the allowable sale quantity (ASQ) for the Bighorn National Forest at 149 million board feet per decade (14.9 million board feet per year). Actual volume sold has fallen well short of the projected levels. Since 1995 the amount of green sawtimber that can be offered for sale has been administratively "capped" at 4.8 million board feet annually until the Forest Plan is revised. Less than 20% of the suited lands are outside of inventoried roadless areas.

**Need for Revision:** The following indicate a need for change in the management of forested lands:

- Projected harvest levels in the current plan are not being achieved.
- Current projected harvest levels and certain prescribed standards and guidelines, particularly associated with visuals and wildlife are not compatible.
- Reevaluation of the tentatively suited lands is required at 10 years (36 CFR 219.12(k)(5)(ii)).
- Allocation of existing roadless areas to timber management prescriptions continues to be very controversial.
- Silvicultural prescriptions specified in various management areas are often in conflict with other multiple use objectives.
- Current forest conditions indicate treatments for products other than sawlogs are needed.

**Proposed Action:** The following actions will be proposed in one or more of the EIS alternatives.

- The Forest land base will be classified into various categories of suitability for timber production within each alternative.
- The allowable sale quantity and long-term sustained yield capacity will be identified for each Plan alternative. Recent analysis indicates that the current ASQ cannot be sustained.
- New and revised goals, objectives, standards, and guidelines will be proposed for harvest prescriptions and logging systems.
- Recommended and allowable timber prescriptions will be adjusted, both in terms of harvest methods and spatial limits, to account for recent information relative to the historic range of variation and natural disturbance regimes on the Bighorns.

#### *Roadless Area Allocation and Management*

**Current Direction:** The President signed the Wyoming Wilderness Act of 1984 (PL 98-550) which designated the 189,039 Cloud Peak Wilderness on the Bighorn National Forest. The Act also

released all remaining areas (those areas not designated as wilderness by the act) to multiple-use management. The current plan allocates many of these remaining roadless areas to prescriptions which allow road building. Approximately 69 percent of the Forest is now classified as roadless.

**Need for Revision:** Inventory of roadless areas is a requirement in the revision process (36 CFR 219.17). Management of inventoried roadless areas continues to be controversial. These conflicts are a result of varying resource demands on the roadless areas.

**Proposed Action:** The proposed action is to complete an inventory of roadless areas, evaluate these areas to determine wilderness potential (36 CFR 219.17), and allocate the roadless areas to varying management area prescriptions with an emphasis on late successional forest and natural disturbances.

#### *Special Areas*

The Bighorn National Forest includes several unique or outstanding areas or resources of physical, biological, or social interest. Collectively these are referred to as "special areas". They may include Wilderness (also discussed above); Wild and Scenic Rivers; Research Natural Areas; and other special areas with scenic, historical, cultural, geological, archaeological, or other outstanding characteristic.

**Current Direction:** In the current plan, there is one management area designated specifically for Wild and Scenic Rivers. The Little Big Horn and Tongue Rivers were determined to be eligible as potential additions to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Designation of the Little Big Horn as Wild and Scenic was recommended to Congress. Congress did not act to officially designate the river, however both remain under the wild and scenic management prescription and their unique qualities are currently safeguarded by specific standards and guidelines.

As mentioned above the Cloud Peak Wilderness area currently consists of 189,039 acres. The Forest Plan was amended in 1998 to revise the standards and guidelines used to manage this Wilderness.

The current plan designated two Research Natural Areas (RNAs), Bull Elk Park (718 acres) and Shell Canyon (730 acres). Several additional areas have been inventoried for possible additions in cooperation with the University of Wyoming.

Based on current data, there is a heritage resource for every 92 acres of land surveyed, or approximately 7 sites per section on the Bighorn National

Forest. These range from the nationally recognized Medicine Wheel National Historic Landmark, to numerous lesser known historic and prehistoric sites and properties. Another important component of the Forests heritage resources is the recognition and protection of Native American Indian spiritual sites.

**Need for Revision:** The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, as amended (December 31, 1992) and Forest Service handbook 1909.12, Chapter 8 direct the Forest Service to evaluate rivers for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System during forest planning. Proposed designation of portions of two eligible rivers, the Little Big Horn and the Tongue, has not been acted on by Congress. These two rivers, as well as other rivers on the forest, need to be evaluated to determine their eligibility for inclusion into the Wild and Scenic River System.

The Forest Service is also required, where applicable, to recommend designations of other special areas such as additions to Wilderness (36 CFR 219.17).

Authority to establish RNA's is delegated to the Chief of the Forest Service at 7 CFR 2.60(a) and 36 CFR 251.23 and shall be made during the planning process. Several potential additions have been recently inventoried.

Better direction needs to be established for the management of the abundant cultural and historic resources on the Bighorn National Forest. Of particular need is to incorporate the Heritage Protection Plan around Medicine Mountain, including the Medicine Wheel National Historic Landmark.

**Proposed Action:**

- Rivers and streams determined to be eligible for potential inclusion in the Wild and Scenic River System will be examined. The next step in the process, the suitability analysis and recommendation to Congress, will not be done as part of this revision.

- Existing roadless areas will be examined for possible recommendation as additions to the Cloud Peak Wilderness Area.

- Areas on the Forest that have been recently inventoried for RNA values will be examined and considered as possible additions to the RNA program to help meet regional and national goals.

- The protection and management of cultural and historic resources will be revised and updated. Of particular need is an increased awareness of Native American sacred sites.

### Travel and Dispersed Recreation Management

**Current Direction:** The demand on the Bighorn Forest for motorized use is significant. Four-wheel drive and all terrain vehicle (ATV) interests want continuing opportunities for off-road and primitive road use. Other recreationists participating in nonmotorized recreation activities are demanding fewer roads and trails be open to motorized use. The existing 1985 Forest Plan incorporated the 1983 travel management plan and map by reference. This travel map has been updated and corrected periodically since 1985.

Dispersed recreation includes all those activities that occur outside developed site i.e. campgrounds and picnic areas. Currently, approximately 60% of total recreation user days on the Forest is dispersed recreation. Estimates indicate this use is increasing at about 2% per year. This level of demand is limiting opportunities for dispersed camping, particularly on weekends and high use times of the year.

**Need for Revision:** Issues and management concerns related to travel management have increased significantly since the 1985 Plan was signed. Use figures for traditional recreation travel, such as pleasure driving, horseback riding, and motorbiking have grown steadily. Other used and demands, such as all-terrain vehicles, snowmobiles, and mountain bikes have dramatically increased over the last decade. Resource impacts and user conflicts have increased proportionately with the increased demand. There is very little specific direction in the existing plan for travel management.

Likewise, many activities associated with dispersed recreation use are creating unacceptable impacts on the land. These include the destruction of riparian areas around dispersed camping sites and popular fishing streams, impacts on water quality at popular dispersed recreation sites resulting from the improper disposal of litter, garbage, and human waste. The destruction of vegetation and the development of "human browse lines" from collecting firewood in heavily used areas, recreational stock damage, including tree girdling, root exposure, soil compaction, and the widening and pioneering of new roads and trails, often in environmentally sensitive areas are also management concerns.

**Proposed Action:** The following actions will be proposed in one or more EIS alternatives:

- Identify an updated road and trail transportation network that provides an environmentally sound and socially responsive travel management system which is consistent across the Forest and well coordinated with adjacent private and public lands.

- Designate permanent or seasonal travel restrictions on those routes that will be decommissioned. Identify new road and trail locations or alignments that are needed to enhance travel needs or protect resource values.

- Clearly specify whether or under what conditions motorized use is allowed in each management area (MA) prescription; provide appropriate standards and guidelines.

- Provide the programmatic Forest wide direction and "Framework" for a site specific travel management plan that is responsive to the issues developed in the revision process. A separate decision will be made on the site specific travel plan.

- Eliminate cross-country motorized travel except on designated routes.

- Adoption of those portions of the pending "Roads Analysis Process" which are specified for forest-level planning, when the policy becomes final.

- The revision of dispersed recreation standards and guidelines will be considered concurrently with travel management proposals to insure consistency.

- Begin a pilot program of "designated dispersed camping" i.e. camping only at designated sites that provide no facilities. Construct toilets and/or require self-contained units in highly impacted areas.

### Involving the Public

The Regional Forester gives notice that the Forest is beginning an environmental analysis and decision-making process for this proposed action. We encourage any interested or affected people to participate in the analysis and contribute to the final decision.

We will provide opportunities for open public discussion of the following proposed action and changes to the revision topics. We encourage the public to comment on this specific proposal. Focusing on the following proposal will generate specific scoping comments on the revision topics and decisions to be made and make the revision process more effective. The Analysis of the Management Situation contains baseline information, including the management areas and the No Action Alternative, to help evaluate how the proposed action and the alternatives address the revision topics and the six decisions (listed previously)

made in forest plan revisions. This information will be available in the spring of 2000.

We will develop a broad range of alternatives (including the No Action Alternative) to the proposed action based on the comments received and on further analysis. Accordingly, we expect the alternatives considered and the final decision to vary from what is put forth in the proposed action.

Public participation is invited throughout the revision process and will be especially important at several points during the process. We will make information available through periodic newsletters, news releases, the Internet on the Forests web site, ([www.fs.fed.us/r2/bighorn](http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/bighorn)) and various public meetings. The first public meeting will be held after the Analysis of the Management Situation is completed in the spring of 2000. Meeting dates will be well published through the media mentioned above.

### Release and Review of the EIS

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public comment in February of 2001. At that time, the EPA will publish a notice of availability for the DEIS in the **Federal Register**. The comment period on the DEIS will be 90 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 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 proposal action participate by the close of the three-month 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 FEIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, 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 Final EIS. The FEIS is scheduled to be completed in December of 2001. The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, environmental consequences discussed in the FEIS, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making decisions regarding the revision. The responsible official will document the decisions and reasons for the decisions in a Record of Decision for the revised Plan. The decision will be subject to appeal in accordance with 36 CFR 217.

Dated: November 1, 1999.

**Lyle Lavery,**  
Regional Forester, Rocky Mountain Region.  
[FR Doc. 99-29354 Filed 11-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### National Forest System Roadless Areas; Correction

**AGENCY:** Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice; correction.

**SUMMARY:** On October 19, 1999, the Forest Service published in the **Federal Register** a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for a proposed rule for the protection of roadless areas. The e-mail address in that notice was incorrect.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christopher Wehrli, telephone: (801) 517-1037.

#### Correction

In the **Federal Register** of October 19, 1999, in FR Doc. 99-56306, on page 56306, in the second column, the first paragraph under the **ADDRESSES** caption should read:

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to the USDA Forest Service-CAET, Attention: Roadless Areas NOI, P.O. Box 221090, Salt Lake City, Utah 84122 or by e-mail through World Wide Web access to: roadless/wo\_\_caet-slc@fs.fed.us.

Dated: November 4, 1999.

**James R. Furnish,**  
Deputy Chief, National Forest System.  
[FR Doc 99-29399 Filed 11-9-99; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Public Meetings on National Forest System Roadless Areas

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meetings.

**SUMMARY:** On October 19, 1999, the Forest Service published a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement to initiate the scoping process for a proposed rule for the protection of roadless areas on National Forest System lands. The agency is giving notice of public meetings that are being held as part of this scoping effort.

**DATES:** The meetings are scheduled from November 16 through December 1, 1999

**ADDRESSES:** The meetings will be held at the locations and times listed in the table under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christopher Wehrli, Content Analysis Enterprise Team, telephone: (801) 517-1037; e-mail: roadless/wo\_\_caet-slc@fs.fed.us

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In addition to requesting written comment in response to the notice of intent published October 19, 1999 (64 FR 56306), the Forest Service is providing an opportunity for the public to participate in scoping meetings on the proposal for protecting the remaining roadless areas within the National Forest System. At these meetings, the agency will clarify the differences between this initiative and the soon to be released proposed changes to the National Forest System Transportation System rules at 36 CFR part 212 and to Forest Service Manual direction.

To accommodate larger numbers of attendees, two scoping meetings will be held each night at the locations and times listed in the following table. Attendees may select either session.

Date	City	Location	Time
Tuesday, November 16 .....	Albuquerque, NM .....	Albuquerque Convention Center, 401 Second Street, NW.	6:00-7:30 7:30-9:00
Tuesday, November 16 .....	Milwaukee, WI .....	University of Wisconsin, Chemistry Building, Room 180, 3210 N. Cramer Avenue.	5:00-6:30 6:30-8:00
Wednesday, November 17 .....	Salt Lake City, UT .....	Salt Palace Convention Center, 100 South West Temple.	6:00-7:30 7:30-9:00
Wednesday, November 17 .....	Missoula, MT .....	University of Montana, Gallagher Busi. Bldg., Room 123, Arthur and Connell Avenues.	6:00-7:30 7:30-9:00
Thursday, November 18 .....	Denver, CO .....	Embassy Suites Downtown Denver, 1881 Curtis Street	6:00-7:30 7:30-9:00
Thursday, November 18 .....	Juneau, AK .....	Centennial Hall Convention Center, 101 Egan Drive .....	5:00-6:30 6:30-8:00
Tuesday, November 30 .....	Portland, OR .....	Oregon Convention Center, 777 NE Martin Luther King Blvd..	5:00-6:30 6:30-8:00
Tuesday, November 30 .....	Atlanta, GA .....	Georgia International Convention Center, 1902 Sullivan Road.	6:30-8:00 8:00-9:30
Wednesday, December 1 .....	Sacramento, CA .....	Capitol Plaza Halls, 1025 9th Street .....	6:00-7:30 7:30-9:00