Dated: July 26, 1996.

Thomas D. Mays,

Director, Office of Technology Development, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health.

[FR Doc. 96–19847 Filed 8–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[CA–066–06–1610–00]

Proposed California Desert Conservation Area Plan Amendment, Palm Springs-South Coast Resource Area, California

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: On March 15, 1996, notice was published in the Federal Register announcing availability of the Proposed California Desert Conservation Area Plan Amendment and Environmental Assessment for a 60-day public review period. In this document, two plan amendments were proposed. Amendment One proposes to expand the Big Morongo Canyon Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) from 3,075 to 29,000 acres to provide more effective management of bighorn sheep habitat, wetlands, riparian areas, wildlife corridors and other sensitive resources. The Big Morongo Canyon ACEC is located six miles north of Interstate 10, just east of Highway 62, straddling the San Bernardino-Riverside County line. Amendment Two proposes to expand the Salt Creek Desert Pupfish/Rail Habitat ACEC from 4,288 to 14,880 acres to protect palm oases, cultural resources, wildlife corridors, wetlands, endangered species habitat and other sensitive resources. The Salt Creek ACEC would also be renamed the Dos Palmas ACEC. The Salt Creek ACEC is located three miles northwest of the Salton Sea, Riverside County, California.

BLM received 12 public comment letters. BLM has reviewed these letters and has incorporated the comments into the proposed plan. BLM is prepared to proceed with the proposed Dos Palmas ACEC expansion (Amendment Two) and Big Morongo Canyon ACEC expansion (Amendment One). In accordance with title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 1610.5–2, citizens with standing may protest the proposed decisions.

DATES: Protests must be submitted in writing no later than 30-days from the date of this notice to the following address: Area Manager, Bureau of Land Management, Palm Springs-South Coast Resource Area, 690 Garnet Avenue, North Palm Springs, CA 92258–2000.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONTACT: Elena Misquez, Bureau of Land Management, Palm Springs-South Coast Resource Area, 690 Garnet Avenue, North Palm Springs, CA 92258–2000; telephone (619) 251–4826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Nothing in this Proposed Plan shall have the effect of terminating any validly issued rights-of-way or customary operation, maintenance, repair, and replacement activities in such rights-of-ways within the ACEC boundaries in accordance with Sections 509(a) and 701(a) of the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976.

Dated: July 26, 1996.

Julia Dougan,

Area Manager.

[FR Doc. 96–19737 Filed 8–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–40–P

[CA–930–06–1020–00, 4000/1790]

Reopening of Scoping Period for an Environmental Impact Statement and Land Use Plan Amendment Involving the Development of Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management on Public Lands in California and Northwestern Nevada

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in California is reopening the scoping period for a statewide Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and land use plan amendment involving the development of Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management as provided in the BLM's new grazing regulations (43 CFR Part 4100). The EIS is being prepared in compliance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This notice invites public input on the development of the Standards and Guidelines, issues to be addressed, planning criteria, and the alternatives to be considered in the EIS.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope of the EIS and Plan Amendment must be received by September 4, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Any scoping comments or requests to be placed on the mailing list should be sent to Rangeland Health Coordinator, Bureau of Land Management, 2135 Butano Drive, Sacramento, CA 95825–0451.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jim Morrison at (916) 979–2830.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The initial scoping period closed April 24, 1996. BLM is reopening the scoping period to provide the public an opportunity to focus on the efforts of the Resource Advisory Councils (RACs) or to submit additional comments on the scope of the EIS.

As indicated in the March 25, 1996 Notice of Intent, BLM's new grazing administration regulations (43 CFR Part 4100), which became effective August 21, 1995, provide for the development of state Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management. A national programmatic EIS was completed by BLM in 1993 in support of the new regulations. This EIS for California and northwestern Nevada will be tiered to the national EIS, and will incorporate applicable information from previously prepared BLM grazing EISs.

The four RACs in California have been working with BLM in developing proposed S&Gs and alternatives. The proposed S&Gs and alternatives must address the following elements: (1) Watershed function; (2) nutrient cycling and energy flow; (3) water quality; (4) habitat for threatened and endangered species and proposed Candidate 1 or 2, or special status species; and (5) habitat quality for native plant and animal populations and communities.

BLM has preliminarily identified, with RACs involvement, three alternatives for analysis in the EIS: (1) RAC S&G Proposals: This alternative would include the recommended S&Gs of each RAC for their respective area in Bakersfield district and northern California. The California Desert District will operate under existing land use plan direction or the fall-back S&Gs, whichever is the more restrictive, until S&Gs can be developed in conjunction with bioregional plans for the West Mojave, Northern and Eastern Colorado, and Northern and Eastern Mojave Deserts, or other specific plan amendments. (2) No Action: This alternative would incorporate the fall-back S&Gs directly from the regulations; (3) Consistency: This alternative would draw from the individual RAC recommended S&Gs to formulate a consolidated set of S&Gs. It may alter some RAC recommendations or add additional S&Gs to improve consistency among the individual RACs and neighboring states of Arizona, Nevada, and Oregon. In addition to analyzing the three alternative described above, the EIS will describe existing land use plan direction.