

QUANTITY BASED SAFEGUARD TRIGGER—Continued

Product	Trigger level	Period
Peanut Butter/Paste	53,000 mt	April 1, 2000 to March 31, 2001.
Raw Cane Sugar	21,031 mt	January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2000.
Refined Sugar and Syrups	2,366,204 mt	October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000.
Blended Syrups	1,945,430 mt	October 1, 2000 to September 30, 2001.
Articles Over 65% Sugar	25,484 mt	October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000.
Articles Over 10% Sugar	27,058 mt	October 1, 2000 to September 30, 2001.
Sweetened Cocoa Powder	0 mt	October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000.
Chocolate Crumb	0 mt	October 1, 2000 to September 30, 2001.
Lowfat Chocolate Crumb	0 mt	October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000.
Infant Formula Containing Oligosaccharides	0 mt	October 1, 2000 to September 30, 2001.
Mixes and Doughs	80,282 mt	October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000.
Mixed Condiments and	80,282 mt	October 1, 2000 to September 30, 2001.
Seasonings	2,445 mt	October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000.
Ice Cream	1,555 mt	October 1, 2000 to September 30, 2001.
Animal Feed Containing Milk	21,252,239 kilograms	January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2000.
Short Staple Cotton	176 kilograms	January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2000.
Harsh or Rough Cotton	84,751 kilograms	January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2000.
Medium Staple Cotton	5,424 mt	October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000.
Extra Long Staple Cotton	6,064 mt	October 1, 2000 to September 30, 2001.
Cotton Waste	253 mt	October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000.
Cotton, Processed, Not Spun	232 mt	October 1, 2000 to September 30, 2001.
	1,516,320 liters	January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2000.
	1,339,075 kilograms	January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2000.
	17,211,112 kilograms	September 20, 1999 to September 19, 2000.
	5,340,573 kilograms	September 20, 2000 to September 19, 2001.
	0 mt	August 1, 1999 to July 31, 2000.
	0 mt	August 1, 2000 to July 31, 2001.
	9,664 kilograms	August 1, 1999 to July 31, 2000.
	622,754 kilograms	August 1, 2000 to July 31, 2001.
	32,995 kilograms	August 1, 1999 to July 31, 2000.
	1,482,280 kilograms	August 1, 2000 to July 31, 2001.
	13,378 kilograms	September 20, 1999 to September 19, 2000.
	0 kilograms	September 20, 2000 to September 19, 2001.
	383 kilograms	September 11, 1999 to September 10, 2000.
	798 kilograms	September 11, 2000 to September 10, 2001.

[FR Doc. 00-5681 Filed 3-8-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Granite Area Mining Projects; Umatilla National Forest, Grant County, Oregon

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

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

SUMMARY: The USDA Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on a proposed action to approve Proposed Plans of Operation on mining claims located in the Granite Area, within the Granite Creek watershed, a tributary to the North Fork John Day River. The project area is located on the North Fork John Day Ranger District, approximately 34 air miles southeast of Ukiah, Oregon.

The proposed action is a compilation of plans submitted by claimants operating within the analysis area. These plans describe the type of mining operations proposed and how they would be conducted, the type and

standard of access routes, the means of transportation to be used, the period during which the proposed mining activity will take place and measures to be taken to meet the requirements for environmental protection. Operations include the exploration and extraction of valuable minerals from placer and lode deposits. Methods range from hand panning to more complex operations utilizing mechanical equipment. The 1990 Land and the Resource Management Plan FEIS for the Umatilla National Forest, as amended, provides overall guidance for management of this area. Some of the operations planned in the proposed action may not be in compliance with this plan.

DATES: Written comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be received on or before April 10, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments and suggestions to the Responsible Official, Craig Smith-Dixon, North Fork John Day District Ranger, P.O. Box 158, Ukiah, OR 97880.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Reed, Project Team Leader, North Fork John Day Ranger District. Phone: (541) 427-3231.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The decision area includes approximately 900 acres of claimed lands within the Umatilla National Forest in Grant County, Oregon. It is within the boundary of the Granite Creek Watershed. The legal description of the decision area is as follows: T8-10S, R34, 35, 35½E, W.M. surveyed. Some proposed activities are within the boundary of the North Fork John Day Wilderness Area.

Gold was discovered in the project area in 1864 and a small gold rush shortly followed. Most of the gold produced in this area was placer gold mined from the gravel and bars of streams. There were also several large producing gold and silver mines. A large-scale dredge operated in many of the area streams in the later 1930's. Most of the big mining was over by the 1950's as the economical discoveries were mined out. Exploration continues but no major production is occurring. Most current mining activity consists of small-scale placer operations.

During the past years, several species of fish residing within streams located in or near the project area have been listed as threatened under the

Endangered Species Act. After reviewing the new listings, the Forest Service has determined that current mining operations could significantly affect these fish species. Therefore it is necessary for persons operating in the project area to submit new or modified Plans of Operations to the Forest Service. Under the regulations at 36 CFR 228.4 and 228.5, and because of the potential significance of the effects, these plans must be analyzed in an Environmental Impact Statement.

Mining operations are associated with the extraction of precious metals from placer and lode deposits. A number of different practices are being proposed on the various claims within the analysis area. These may include one or more of the following practices:

Suction Dredging: Portable suction dredges would be used in stream during the period specified by the State of Oregon, generally July 15 to August 15.

Test Pits: Holes are dug either by hand or mechanical equipment to sample sub-surface deposits.

Drilling: Portable drills are used as part of the exploration process to sample sub-surface mineral deposits.

Placer Mining: This includes a wide variety of practices to extract minerals from placer deposits. The techniques include handwork with shovels and pans, small sluice boxes and more complex operations that use mechanical equipment. On the more heavily worked claims backhoes and front end loaders are used for digging, and power trommels for separation and extraction. Water, to varying degrees, is used in all these techniques. Some minor road maintenance and maintenance of existing structures is also planned.

Lode Mining: This includes tunneling or other mechanical methods used to extract lode deposits.

Activities, which would occur in association with mining operation, include mitigation practices such as construction or maintenance of settling ponds, and reclamation activities such as recontouring, seeding, and treatment of noxious weeds.

Preliminary issues include: effects of proposed activities on water quality and the effects of proposed activities on fish habitat and aquatic Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species.

The Forest Service will consider a full range of alternatives, including a "no-action" alternative in which no mining activities would be approved. The no-action alternative is evaluated in order to establish a baseline condition of existing and future environmental conditions in the project area. Based on the issues gathered through scoping, the action alternatives may vary in the type

of operations permitted, the timing of permitted operations and the types of mitigation required. Tentative action alternatives are: the proposed action and an alternative that modifies the proposed plans with additional mitigation to address effects of mining on water quality and fisheries habitat.

Public participation will be especially important at several points during the analysis, beginning with the scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7). Initial scoping began with the project listing in the 2000 Winter Edition of the Umatilla National Forest's Schedule of Proposed Activities. This environmental analysis and decision making process will enable additional interested and affected people to participate and contribute to the final decision. The public is encouraged to take part in the process and is encouraged to visit with Forest Service officials at any time during the analysis and prior to the decision. The Forest Service will be seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, local agencies, and other individuals or organizations that may be interested in, or affected by the proposal. This input will be used in preparation of the Draft EIS. The scoping process includes:

1. Identifying potential issues.
2. Identifying major issues to be analyzed in depth.
3. Identifying issues which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental analysis.
4. Considering additional alternatives based on themes which will be derived from issues recognized during scoping activities.
5. Identifying potential environmental effects of this project and alternatives (i.e. direct, indirect, and cumulative effects and connected actions).

The Draft EIS is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available to the public for review by September 1, 2000. At that time, the EPA will publish a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS in the **Federal Register**. The comment period on the Draft EIS will be 45 days from the date the EPA publishes the Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register**. It is important that those interested in the management of the Umatilla National Forest participate at that time. The Final EIS is scheduled to be completed by December 1, 2000. In the Final EIS, the Forest Service is required to respond to comments and responses received during the comment period that pertain to the environmental consequences discussed in the Draft EIS and applicable laws, regulations, and policies considered in making a decision regarding the proposal.

Comments received in response to this notice, including names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposed action and will be available for public inspection. Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered; however, those who submit anonymous comments will not have standing to appeal the subsequent decision under 36 CFR Parts 215. Additionally, pursuant to 7 CFR 1.27(d), any person may request the agency to withhold a submission from the public record by showing how the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) permits such confidentiality. Persons requesting such confidentiality should be aware that, under the FOIA, confidentiality may be granted in only very limited circumstances, such as to protect trade secrets. The Forest Service will inform the requester of the agency's decision regarding the request for confidentiality, and where the request is denied, the agency will return the submission and notify the requester that the comments may be resubmitted with or without name and address within a specified number of days.

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 Draft EIS's must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts the 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 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 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 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 is the lead agency. Craig Smith-Dixon, District Ranger, is the Responsible Official. As the Responsible Official, he will decide which, if any, of the proposed plans will be implemented. He will document the decision and reasons for the decision in the Record of Decision. That decision will be subject to Forest Service Appeal Regulations (36 CFR part 215).

Dated: February 24, 2000.

Craig Smith-Dixon,
District Ranger.

[FR Doc. 00-5726 Filed 3-8-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Revised Land and Resource Management Plan for the White Mountain National Forest; Carroll, Coos, and Grafton Counties, NH and Oxford County, ME

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice; Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to inform the public that the Forest Service intends to prepare an environmental impact statement for revising the White Mountain National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1604(f)(5) and 36 CFR 219.12.

The Forest Plan guides the overall management of the Forest. Six primary decisions are made in the Forest Plan:

1. Forest wide multiple-use goals and objectives (as required by 36 CFR 219.11[b])
2. Forest wide management requirements (36 CFR 219.27)
3. Management area direction (36 CFR 219.11[c])
4. Lands suited and not suited for timber production (36 CFR 219.14, 219.16, 219.21)
5. Monitoring and evaluation requirements (36 CFR 219.11[d])
6. Recommendations to Congress (for example Wilderness recommendation) (36 CFR 219.17)

The purpose for the revision rests in the requirements of the National Forest

Management Act and its implementing regulations (U.S.C. 1604[f][5] and 36 CFR 219.10[g]). Forest Plans provide direction for administering the National Forests. Forest Plans are revised every 10 to 15 years. The White Mountain National Forest Plan was approved in 1986. The Forest is nearing the end of the 10-15 year cycle.

The need to revise the Forest Plan is based on changed public expectations, changing agency direction, monitoring and evaluations, and the availability of new information. Specific indicators of the need are: (1) There is growing demand for all recreation uses on the Forest. There is demand for types of recreation uses on the Forest that are not currently being provided; (2) Agency goals and objectives, along with other national guidance for strategic plans and programs, have changed since 1986; (3) Results of monitoring and evaluation suggest the need for revision; and (4) A vast amount of new scientific information has been published since 1986, including technical reports published from research by the Forest Service, as well as universities and organizations that study forest ecosystems and forest management.

The process of revising the Forest Plan will focus on those items that have been identified as most in need of revision. To provide guidance for developing Forest Plan goals and direction the Forest developed a statement describing the role of the Forest in New England, which is basically to manage the White Mountain National Forest under the concept of ecosystem, social and economic sustainability. The issues identified through initial public outreach have been used to identify 23 Revision Topics. The 23 topics are:

1. Air Quality.
2. American Indian Consultation.
3. Biodiversity.
4. Budget and Cost Effectiveness.
5. Commercial Minerals.
6. Environmental Education/Visitor Information.
7. Fire.
8. Heritage Resources.
9. Land Acquisition and Exchange.
10. Monitoring.
11. Recreation Opportunities and Use.
12. Roadless Areas.
13. Roads.
14. Scenery Management.
15. Soil Productivity.
16. Special Uses.
17. Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Sensitive Species.
18. Timber Management.
19. Watershed and Aquatic Ecosystems.
20. Wild and Scenic Rivers.

21. Wilderness Management.

22. Wilderness Recommendation.

23. Wildlife Habitat Management.

Additional detail on the Revision Topics is available on request, in the form of the document titled "Need for Change, Description of Proposal for Revising the White Mountain National Forest". You are encouraged to review this additional document prior to commenting on the Notice of Intent. You may request the additional information by calling the phone number listed below, by writing or e-mailing to the addresses listed in this notice, or by accessing the Forest web page at www.fs.fed.us/r9/white.

The past thirteen years of Forest Plan implementation and information from new scientific studies have yielded information that was not available when the direction of the existing Forest Plan was developed. We propose to use the new information to update and add management direction for the previously described revision topics.

A range of alternatives will be considered when revising the Forest Plan. The alternatives will address different options to resolve concerns raised as revision topics listed above and to fulfill the purpose and need. A "no-action alternative" is required, meaning the management would continue under the existing Forest Plan. Alternatives will provide different ways to address and respond to public issues, management concerns, and resource opportunities identified during the scoping process.

The alternatives will display different mixes of recreation opportunities and experiences. We will examine alternatives that address the public's concerns for less timber harvest, for greater timber harvest, and meeting currently planned harvest levels. The alternatives will display different mixes of wildlife habitats across the forest. The mix will vary by the objectives of the particular alternative, though each alternative will be managed to contain the habitat necessary to maintain viable populations of wildlife species. Management of roadless areas will vary by the objectives of any particular alternatives, physical criteria for evaluating each individual roadless area, and public input. In addition, the alternatives will incorporate a range of Wilderness recommendations.

The environmental analysis and decision-making process will include many opportunities for public participation and comment so that people interested in this proposal may contribute to the final decision. The draft environmental impact statement is tentatively scheduled for release in