current direction in the Forest Plan would not be amended. The SMA area would continue to be available for surface occupancy by using controlled surface use stipulations.

The draft supplement to the FEIS is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review by June 1996. At that time, EPA will publish a notice of availability of the draft supplement in the Federal Register.

The comment period for the draft supplement to the FEIS will be 45 days from the date the EPA's notice of availability appears in the Federal Register. It is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate at that time. To be the most helpful, comments on the draft supplement to the environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible and may address the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed (see The Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3).

In addition, Federal court decisions have established that 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 reviewers' position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* v. *NRDC,* 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. *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). The reason for this is to ensure 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.

After the comment period ends on the draft supplement, the comments will be analyzed, considered, and responded to by the Forest Service in preparing the final supplement to the environmental impact statement. The final is scheduled to be completed by September 1996. The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, environmental consequences discussed in the final supplement, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making a decision regarding this proposal. The responsible official will document the decision and reasons for the decision in a Record of Decision (ROD). This ROD will be consistent with the scope of the environmental analysis in the supplement and address only the two oil and gas leasing decisions (consent and availability) within the Laurel Fork SMA. That decision will be subject to appeal under 36 CFR 217.

The Forest Service is the lead agency. The BLM will be a cooperating agency in this supplement.

The responsible official is Robert C. Joslin, Regional Forester, Southern Region, 1720 Peachtree Road, NW, Atlanta, Georgia 30367.

Dated: February 23, 1996.

Robert D. Bowers,

Acting Regional Forester.

[FR Doc. 96–5023 Filed 3–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

Eldorado National Forest, CA; Notice of Intent

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Revision of notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: On November 7, 1989, the Forest Service filed a notice of intent in the Federal Register to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) to analyze management of off-highway vehicle use in the Rock Creek area, Eldorado National Forest, Georgetown Ranger District, El Dorado County, California. This notice is being filed to update that notice of intent and to notify interested parties that the Draft EIS will soon be available for comment.

ADDRESSES: Raymond LaBoa, District Ranger, Georgetown Ranger District, Eldorado National Forest, ATTN: Rock Creek EIS, 7600 Wentworth Springs Road, Georgetown, California 92634.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Direct questions about the EIS to Linda Earley, Interdisciplinary Team Leader, Georgetown Ranger District, 7600 Wentworth Springs Road, Georgetown, California 95634; phone (916) 333–4312.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Work on the EIS began in 1989 with a study of impacts to the Pacific Deer Herd. Since that time the deer study has been completed, issues identified, alternative management plans developed, and extensive data collection and analysis conducted. The Draft Rock Creek Recreational Trails EIS is now nearly complete and is expected to be released late in March 1996.

The Draft EIS analyzes alternative management plans for all types of recreation uses on the trails: hiking, equestrians, mountain bikes, and OHVs. The need to look at all uses of the trails arose from concerns that other types of recreation use may have some of the same impacts as OHVs; as well as concerns about compatibility of uses.

Another concern identified in the analysis is open road densities which exceed limits established in the Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource management Plan (LRMP). Because the EIS analyzes road and trail densities, and because the EIS proposes designation of both open and closed roads for OHV use, it was decided that proposals for road closures to meet the LRMP management direction would be also analyzed in this EIS.

The following issues identified during scoping for this EIS were used to develop and compare alternative management plans.

1. Erosion: The bare soils on road and trail surfaces create a potential for erosion. The amount of erosion may be affected by total miles of roads and trails, soil type, trail location, design, maintenance, grade, vegetative cover, and use in excessively wet or dry conditions.

2. Water Quality: Erosion of soils can impact water quality by adding sedimentation to streams. Sedimentation may be affected by trail location and design, stream crossings, and proximity of trails to stream. Another potential impact to water quality from use of trails is the risk of oil or fuel spills at stream crossings.

3. Wildlife Species: Use of the trails has the potential to impact wildlife species primarily through disturbance by human presence or noise. Road and trail densities influence the potential disturbance by providing increased or decreased access into the area.

4. Air Quality: Air quality may be affected by emissions from motorized vehicles as well as dust from use of roads and trails.

5. Noise: The sound of OHVs is unacceptable to many people, and therefore may have a negative impact on adjacent landowners and the experience of other Forest users. The sound of OHV's may also contribute to disturbance of wildlife.

6. Opportunity and Quality of the Recreation Experience: The quality of the recreation experience may be affected by: the condition, variety, and level of challenge of the trails; the availability of staging areas and the level of development there; other uses allowed on the trails; and the aesthetics of the trail experience. Opportunity for recreation is determined by the trail mileage available and uses allowed on each; the number and size of recreation

evens allowed; and the frequency and duration of trail closures.

7. Health and Safety: Safety may be affected by a variety of factors. Width of trails may affect speeds traveled, and therefore risk of accidents. Intersections of roads and trails may pose increased risks of accidents. Combination of equestrian and mountain bike use of trails may pose a risk since bikes come up quietly and may startle horses. Two-way traffic poses a risk for OHVs since they cannot hear each other coming, which could result in a head-on collison. Chipsealing of road surfaces poses a risk to equestrians due to the slippery contact between the chipseal and the horseshoes. Trail structures such as gabions and cinderblocks may also pose a risk to horses. Health may be affected by availability of drinking water and sanitation facilities for recreationists; or by impacts to air quality and water quality.

8. Risk of Fire: Risk of fire is increased by human activity such as campfires and smoking that may be associated with use of trails. Internal combustion engines, such as OHVs also increase the risk, particularly if proper spark arresters are not in place.

9. Funding: Levels of funding available affects the ability to maintain trails properly, the number of trails that can be maintained, ability to construct trails, ability to effectively rehabilitate closed trails, the amount of monitoring that can be conducted, and the level of law enforcement that can be maintained. These in turn, affect the ability to implement the management plan and, therefore, to protect the environment and the quality of the recreation experience.

The following alternatives are analyzed in the Draft EIS:

Alternative 1—No Action:

This alternative would continue the current management of the Rock Creek Trails. Most trails in the area are multiple use, open to all four use types: hiking, equestrians, mountain bikes, and OHVs. There are approximately 140 miles of multiple use routes (roads and trails) and 5 miles of routes restricted to non-motorized uses. The current management plan includes clousure of the Critical Deer Winter Range to OHVs and mountain bikes from November 1 to may 1 each year. Trails are also closed to OHVs during wet weather conditions.

Alternative 2—No OHV Use: OHV use would be eliminated in this alternative. There would be approximately 46 miles of non-motorized routes available. Approximately 31 miles of roads would be closed. Trails would be closed to equestrians and mountain bikes during wet weather conditions, and staging areas in the Critical Deer Winter Range would be closed from February 1 to May 1. Up to two large recreation events, with up to 300 participants, would be allowed each year for each non-motorized use type.

Alternative 3—Increased Multiple Use Recreation: This alternative reduces trail closures and allows the maximum trail density. Approximately 141 miles of multiple use routes would be available, and 15 miles of non-motorized routes. Approximately 28 miles of roads would be closed. There would be no closure of the Critical Deer Winter Range. Wet weather closures would apply to OHVs, equestrians, and mountain bikes, but an all-season route would be provided that could be used during those closures. Up to two large recreation events per year, with up to 500 participants each, would be allowed for each use type.

Alternative 4—Separated Multiple Use Recreation: This alternative addresses concerns about shared use of trails by different types of uses. The system would include approximately 84 miles of multiple use routes, 17 miles of non-motorized routes, 5 miles of hiking only routes, and 11 miles of hiking and equestrian routes. Approximately 26 miles of roads would be closed. Staging areas in the Critical Deer Winter Range would be closed from February 1 to May 1. Trails would be closed to OHVs, equestrians, and mountain bikes during wet weather conditions. One large recreation event would be allowed per year for each use type, with up to 300 participants in each.

Alternative 5—Reduced Multiple Use Recreation: This alternative includes approximately 69 miles of multiple use routes and 29 miles of non-motorized routes. Approximately 32 miles of roads would be closed. Routes in the Critical Dear Winter Range would be closed to all uses from November 10 to May 1 of each year. Roads and trails would be closed to OHVs, equestrians, and mountain bikes during the Forest seasonal road closures (generally November through March). Trails would be closed to OHVs during Forest fire restrictions (generally August and September). Large recreation events with over 75 people involved would be prohibited.

Alternative 6—''Carrying Capacity'' Alternative: This alternative was developed based on a review of effects of other alternatives. The goal of the alternative is to maximize recreation opportunity while providing protection of the natural resources. The system would include approximately 108 miles of multiple use routes, and 13 miles of non-motorized routes. Approximately 32 miles of roads would be closed. Routes in the Critical Dear Winter Range would be closed to all uses from December 1 to May 1 each year, with the exception of an all-season route which traverses the area. Routes would be closed to OHVs, equestrians, and mountain bikes during wet weather conditions with the exception of the all season routes. Up to two recreation events, with up to 300 participants, would be allowed each year for each type of use.

Raymond LaBoa, District Ranger, Georgetown Ranger District, Eldorado National Forest, is the responsible official.

The draft EIS is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review in late March 1996. 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 EPA's notice of availability appears in the Federal Register. It is very important that reviewers participate at that time. To be the most helpful, comments on the draft EIS should be as specific as possible and may address the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed (see The Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3). In addition, Federal court decisions have established that reviewers of draft EIS's must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewers' position and contentions, *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* v. *NRDC,* 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978), and that environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final EIS. *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc.* v. *Harris,* 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). The reason for this is to ensure 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 EIS.

After the comment period ends on the draft EIS, the comments will be analyzed and considered by the Forest Service in preparing the final EIS. The final EIS is scheduled to be completed by September 1996. The Forest Service is required to respond in the final EIS to the comments received (40 CFR 1503.4). The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, disclosure of environmental

consequences, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making a decision regarding this proposal. The responsible official will document the decision and rationale in the Record of Decision. That decision will be subject to appeal.

Dated: February 23, 1996.

Raymond E. LaBoa,

District Ranger, Georgetown Ranger District, Eldorado National Forest.

[FR Doc. 96–5085 Filed 3–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Computer System Security and Privacy Advisory Board, Meeting

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App., notice is hereby given that the Computer System Security and Privacy Advisory Board will meet Wednesday, March 27 and Thursday, March 28, 1996 from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The Advisory Board was established by the Computer Security Act of 1987 (P.L. 100–235) to advise the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of NIST on security and privacy issues pertaining to federal computer systems. All sessions will be open to the public.

DATES: The meeting will be held on March 27 and 28, 1996 from 9:00 a.m. to 5;00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will take place at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899–0001.

Agenda:

—Welcome, Introduction of New Members, and Overview
—Issues Update
—Encryption Update
—Telecommuting Security Issues
—NARA E–Mail Policy Briefing
—Pending Business
—Public Participation
—Agenda development for June meeting
—Wrap-Up

Public participation: The Board agenda will include a period of time, not to exceed thirty minutes, for oral comments and questions from the public. Each speaker will be limited to five minutes. Members of the public who are interested in speaking are asked to contact the Board Secretariat at the telephone number indicated below. In addition, written statements are invited and may be submitted to the Board at any time. Written statements should be directed to the Computer Systems Laboratory, Building 820, Room 426, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899–0001. It would be appreciated if fifteen copies of written material were submitted for distribution to the Board by March 11, 1996. Approximately 20 seats will be available for the public and media.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Edward Roback, Board Secretariat, Computer Systems Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Building 820, Room 426, Gaithersburg, MD 20899–0001, telephone: (301) 975–3696.

Dated: February 27, 1996.

Samuel Kramer,

Associate Director.

[FR Doc. 96–5027 Filed 3–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–M

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 022796A]

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; Meetings

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meetings.

SUMMARY: The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Squid, Mackerel, Butterfish Committee and Large Pelagics Committee will hold public meetings.

DATES: The meetings will be held on March 19, 1996. The Squid, Mackerel, Butterfish Committee will meet from 9:30 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. The Large Pelagics Committee will meet from 2:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meetings will be held at the Days Inn (at airport), 4101 Island Avenue, Philadelphia, PA; telephone: (215) 492–0400.

Council Address: Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 300 S. New Street, Dover, DE 19901; telephone: (302) 674–2331.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David R. Keifer, Executive Director; telephone: (302) 674–2331.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of these meetings is to review material prepared by staff for resubmission of Amendment 5 to the Squid, Mackerel, Butterfish Plan, and to discuss the quota for large coastal sharks and issues related to Atlantic tunas and swordfish.

Special Accommodations

These meetings are physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Joanna Davis at (302) 674–2331 at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Dated: February 28, 1996.

Richard W. Surdi,

Acting Director, Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 96–5099 Filed 3–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

[I.D. 022796B]

Endangered Species; Permits

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Receipt of applications for a scientific research permit (P770#70) and modifications to two scientific research permits (P563A and P510).

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Coastal Zone and Estuarine Studies Division, NMFS, in Seattle, WA (CZESD) has applied in due form for a permit and the Northern Wasco County People's Utility District in The Dalles, OR (NWCPUD) and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes in Fort Hall, ID (SBT) have applied in due form for modifications to permits to take endangered and threatened species for the purpose of scientific research.

DATES: Written comments or requests for a public hearing on any of these applications must be received on or before April 4, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The applications and related documents are available for review in the following offices, by appointment:

Office of Protected Resources, F/PR8, NMFS, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910-3226 (301-713-1401); and

Environmental and Technical Services Division, 525 NE Oregon Street, Suite 500, Portland, OR 97232-4169 (503-230-5400).

Written comments or requests for a public hearing should be submitted to the Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CZESD requests a permit and NWCPUD and SBT request modifications to permits