OCTOBER 1, 1996, STATE-BY-STATE SHEEP REFERENDUM RESULTS

State	Yes votes	No votes	Total votes	Yes volume	No volume	Total volume
ALABAMA	14	7	21	536	264	800
ALASKA	2	0	2	150	0	150
ARIZONA	25	20	45	11864	26198	38062
ARKANSAS	23	6	29	412	391	803
CALIFORNIA	376	142	518	251769	200997	452766
COLORADO	171	142	313	227550	349351	576901
CONNECTICUT	12	4	16	1017	9168	10185
DELAWARE	2	1	3	195	40	235
FLORIDA	11	2	13	498	100	598
GEORGIA	24	8	32	475	80295	80770
HAWAII	0	0	0	0	0	0
IDAHO	106	74	180	119748	81505	201253
ILLINOIS	224	133	357	10901	9378	20279
INDIANA	223	122	345	11067	12356	23423
IOWA	353	552	905	78253	125264	203517
KANSAS	171	255	426	15753	57142	72895
KENTUCKY	64	12	76	3004	784	3788
LOUISIANA	12	1	13	377	160	537
MAINE	17	11	28	1004	1427	2431
MARYLAND	64	25	89	3956	2962	6918
MASSACHUSETTS	16	19	35	1347	97713	99060
MICHIGAN	151	68	219	21479	74260	95739
MINNESOTA	251	269	520	19569	81629	101198
MISSISSIPPI	47	5	52	809	28	837
MISSOURI	125	122	247	8699	16023	24722
MONTANA	314	677	991	130731	286167	416898
NEBRASKA	125	200	325	15011	34826	49837
NEVADA	10	28	38	17102	130879	147981
NEW HAMPSHIRE	35	10	45	609	865	1474
NEW JERSEY	22	33	55	2454	84712	87166
NEW MEXICO	83	112	195	52378	97078	149456
NEW YORK	77	163	240	3646	278898	282544
NORTH CAROLINA	68	9	77	3453	74	3527
NORTH DAKOTA	102	223	325	17019	66487	83506
OHIO	356	240	596	17475	50098	67573
OKLAHOMA	64	34	98	6549	8433	14982
OREGON	91	291	382	16760	242485	259245
PENNSYLVANIA	180	189	369	12444	14573	27017
RHODE ISLAND	18	3	21	387	30767	31154
SOUTH CAROLINA	12	4	16	26515	8383	34898
SOUTH DAKOTA	127	867	994	67609	279773	347382
TENNESSEE	83	18	101	2639	586	3225
TEXAS	546	442	988	384676	471467	856143
UTAH	132	28	160	115384	40477	155861
VERMONT	46	26	72	1464	52516	53980
VIRGINIA	91	63	154	7780	3288	11068
WASHINGTON	174	86	260	41803	62693	104496
WEST VIRGINIA	111	26	137	7619	1884	9503
WISCONSIN	145	152	297	13180	17314	30494
WYOMING	107	353	460	201865	422983	624848
Total	5603	6277	11880	1956984	3915141	5872125

Dated: June 23, 1997.

Barry L. Carpenter,

Director, Livestock and Seed Division.

[FR Doc. 97–16910 Filed 6–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Southwestern Region; Coconino National Forest, Arizona; Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Windmill Range Allotment

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

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

SUMMARY: The Coconino National Forest of the Forest Service is planning to prepare an environmental impact statement on proposals to change cattle management on the 248,792 acre Windmill Allotment planning area.

DATES: This analysis has been ongoing and public participation has occurred at various stages. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be published in July of 1997.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Mormon Lake Ranger Districts, 4373 S. Lake Mary Road, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001, Reference: Windmill EIS.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Send comments to Mormon Lake Ranger District, 4373 S. Lake Mary Road, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001, Reference: Windmill EIS.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: Fred Trevey, Coconino Forest Supervisor.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: District Range Staff, Mike Hannemann, (520) 774–1147.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Windmill Allotment Management Plan was updated in 1982 to address the distribution of livestock. In 1988 the Allotment plan for the Winter Division was updated to change the grazing system to improve the growth of cool-season *Stipa* grasses and overall range conditions.

In 1994, the Peaks, Mormon Lake and Sedona Ranger Districts in partnership with the Arizona Game and Fish Department and the Windmill Ranch initiated a comprehensive analysis of the Windmill Allotment to update the Allotment Management Plan. The Allotment was selected for analysis to address:

Large, open meadows that are in poor condition indicating an imbalance between plant growth and use of plants throughout the meadows;

Riparian areas that are in less than preferable condition;

Management of threatened, endangered and sensitive species;

Administrative inefficiencies (three allotment plans versus one plan);

Fragmentation indicating a need for landscape scale planning;

Livestock/elk conflicts.

In 1995, a 10 year grazing permit was issued for the Windmill Allotment under the term of the Rescission Bill (Burns Amendment). This permit included some interim mitigating measures including fencing riparian and sensitive plant habitats, sweeping cattle from driveways and shipping culled cows. As required by this legislation, the Allotment was then rescheduled for comprehensive analysis within the 10 year period.

In 1996, the comprehensive analysis was continued. The core team focused on gaining an understanding of relationships between forage production, soils, tree densities, climate, past grazing, and the dietary needs of cattle and elk. Further, the team focused on judging where forage dietary needs and grazing use were out of balance with the lands ability to produce forage with upward trends and designing management actions to respond to problem areas. The following describes the analysis in detail.

Specifically, the purpose of this analysis is to evaluate the grazing use on the Windmill Allotment and to propose options for moving toward resource improvement goals and objectives. Cattle grazing alternatives (including no cattle grazing) are being considered. If a cattle grazing alternative is selected, a new permit will be issued along with a new Allotment Management Plan (AMP).

Tentative alternatives are: 1. Alternative A is designed to meet all the current grazing management issues while maintaining a viable ranching operation. This alternative uses permittee and range conservationist knowledge to determine proper livestock numbers, graze periods, graze rotations, and pasture splits. Total livestock numbers are 1252 to 1257.

2. Alternative B is the no action alternative as required by the National Environmental Policy Act regulations. Selection of this alternative would mean that no grazing would occur on this allotment for the next 10 years.

3. Alternative C is the management system currently in place. This alternative permits a total of 1,252 to 1,257 cattle to graze year-round on the Windmill Range Allotment.

4. Alternative D is designed to respond to grazing capacity and proper use guideline issues. This alternative uses timberstand data base and TES data to project total yearly forage production for each pasture. Total livestock numbers are 635.

5. Alternative F is the same as Alternative A except for adjusting the Luke Mountain pasture of the Foxboro Herd from a two-way pasture split to a three-way pasture split. This third pasture reduces graze periods in Little T-Six from 20 to 10 days and Highway Camp from 14–20 days to 10 days. Total livestock numbers are 1252 to 1257.

6. Alternative G is designed to better meet resource concerns of poor and declining range conditions in parts of Munds-Pocket and Foxboro Herd areas. This alternative improves on Alternative A in these areas by reducing livestock numbers, adjusting graze periods and additional pasture splits. Total livestock numbers are 1090 to 1125.

Items common to alternatives include fencing some riparian areas to exclude livestock. The areas chosen for fencing are easily accessed by cattle, are fairly large and have adjacent wet meadows and are estimated to have high potential for improvement. Not all riparian springs located on the Allotment are fenced. Those not chosen for fencing are less accessible to cattle, are not associated with wet meadows and are estimated to have high potential for improvement. Not all riparian springs located on the Allotment are fenced. Those not chosen for fencing are less accessible to cattle, are not associated with wet meadows and are very small. Major creeks and rivers will not have direct cattle access under any of the alternatives. Other items common to all alternatives include tank re-location and/or waterlot construction where tanks occur in dry meadows. Pastures that will not be used in the 10 year management plan period are also identified.

Environmental analysis has been ongoing. It is anticipated that a draft environmental impact statement will be published in July of 1997. A ninety day comment period pursuant to 36 CFR 219.10(b) will be provided for the public to make comments on the draft environmental impact statement. A record of decision will be prepared and filed with the final environmental impact statement. A ninety day appeal period pursuant to 36 CFR 217.8(a) will be applicable. The ninety day comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will begin when the Environmental Protection Agency's Notice of Availability appears in the **Federal Register.**

To be most helpful, comments on the draft 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 Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3).

This is the second notice for this draft environmental impact statement. The publication of the draft was changed from our original estimate of February, 1997 to July, 1997.

Fred Trevey,

Coconino Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 97–16885 Filed 6–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–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.

SUMMARY: The Committee has received proposals to add to the Procurement List commodities and services to be furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities.