Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 66, No. 123

Tuesday, June 26, 2001

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Senior Executive Service: Membership of Performance Review Board

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Performance Review Board will initiate their labors on or about June 28, 2001. The following persons are members of the Performance Review Board for 2001.

Members

Corbett M. Flannery, Chair
Arnold J. Haiman, SES Member
Michael G. Kitay, SES Member
Adrienne R. Rish, SES Member
Franklin C. Moore, SES Member
John L. Wilkinson, SES Member

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Anne Conboy, 202–712–5438.

Dated: June 14, 2001.

Henry W. Reynolds,

Executive Secretary, Executive Resources Board.

[FR Doc. 01–16008 Filed 6–25–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6116–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Annual List of Newspapers To Be Used by the Alaska Region for Publication of Legal Notices of Proposed Actions and Notices of Decisions Subject to Administrative Appeal Under 36 CFR Parts 215 and 217

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice lists the newspapers that Ranger Districts, Forests, and the Regional Office of the Alaska Region will use to publish legal notice of all decisions subject to appeal under 36 CFR parts 215 and 217, and to publish notices for public comment on actions subject to the notice and comment provisions of 36 CFR part 215. The intended effect of this action is to inform interested members of the public which newspapers will be used to publish legal notice of actions subject to public comment and decisions subject to appeal under 36 CFR parts 215 and 217, thereby allowing them to receive constructive notice of a decision, to provide clear evidence of timely notice, and to achieve consistency in administering the appeals process.

DATES: Publication of legal notices in the listed newspapers begins on July 1, 2001. This list of newspapers will remain in effect until it is superseded by a new list, published in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Robin Dale, Alaska Region Appeal Coordinator; Forest Service, Alaska Region; PO Box 21628; Juneau, Alaska 99802–1628.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robin Dale, Alaska Region Appeal Coordinator, (907) 586–9344.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice provides the list of newspapers that Responsible Officials in the Alaska Region will use to give notice of decisions subject to notice, comment, and appeal under 36 CFR part 215, and that Deciding Officers in the Alaska Region will use to give legal notice of decisions subject to appeal under 36 CFR part 217. The timeframe for comment on a proposed action shall be based on the date of publication of the notice of the proposed action in the principal newspaper. The timeframe for appeal under 36 CFR parts 215 and 217 shall be based on the date of publication of the legal notice of the decision in the principal newspaper.

The newspapers to be used for giving notice of Forest Service decisions in the Alaska Region are as follows:

Alaska Regional Office

Decisions of the Alaska Regional Forester: Juneau Empire, published daily except Saturday and official holidays in Juneau, Alaska; and the Anchorage Daily News, published daily in Anchorage, Alaska.

Chugach National Forest

Decisions of the Forest Supervisor and District Rangers: Anchorage Daily News, published daily in Anchorage, Alaska.

Tongass National Forest

Decisions of the Forest Supervisor: Juneau Empire, published daily except Saturday and official holidays in Juneau, Alaska.

Decisions of the Craig District Ranger, the Ketchikan/Misty District Ranger, and the Thorne Bay District Ranger: Ketchikan Daily News, published daily except Sundays and official holidays in Ketchikan, Alaska.

Decisions of the Admiralty Island National Monument Ranger, the Juneau District Ranger, the Hoonah District Ranger, and the Yakutat District Ranger: Juneau Empire, published daily except Saturday and official holidays in Juneau, Alaska.

Decisions of the Petersburg District Ranger: Petersburg Pilot, published weekly in Petersburg, Alaska.

Decisions of the Sitka District Ranger: Daily Sitka Sentinel, published daily except Saturday, Sunday, and official holidays in Sitka, Alaska.

Decisions of the Wrangell District Ranger: Wrangell Sentinel, published weekly in Wrangell, Alaska.

Supplemental notices may be published in any newspaper, but the timeframes for making comments or filings appeals will be calculated based upon the date that notices are published in the newspapers of record listed in this notice.

Dated: June 7, 2001.

James A. Caplan,

Acting Regional Forester.

[FR Doc. 01–15940 Filed 6–25–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Integrated Treatment of Noxious and Invasive Weeds Within the Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott National Forests

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

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

SUMMARY: The Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement to document the analysis and disclose the effects of implementation of an integrated treatment of noxious and invasive weeds within the Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott National Forests.

The proposed action would authorize the annual treatments of 2,000 acres per

year to a projected high of 10,000 acres per year scattered throughout the three national forests, depending on budget. The majority of treatments will be found along major travel corridors (e.g. railroads, interstates, and state highways as well as Level 3 or 4 roads on the Forests) and within the ponderosa pine vegetation zone in the Verde and Little Colorado watersheds. If approved, project operations will begin in the spring or summer of 2002, and would continue for the next five-to-ten years, barring any significant, environmental changes. Efforts will be made to coordinate annual programs with treatments undertaken by other federal and state agencies and private individuals. To allow flexibility in the treatment of noxious weeds, another component of the proposed action is the inclusion of adaptive management practices, which include the following:

1. Treatment of infestations of noxious weeds that may become established but which are not currently identified on the species list or known to occur on the forests;
2. Utilization of an Integrated Vegetation Management (IVM) approach, which incorporates a variety of methods for prevention, containment, and control of site-specific weed infestations;
3. The use of approved herbicides that may not be exclusively listed in the proposed action;
4. The application of new research on the use of biological control, suitable herbicides, and vegetation competition, and ecosystem information on the vulnerability to invasion, and;
5. If prescribed management fails to result in the desired outcome, alternative strategies will be developed, and management will be adapted until the desired conditions are achieved, which could involve an increase in the estimated annual acreage of treatment.

The various methods that may be analyzed under an IVM approach include: (a) Manual: Hand-grubbing, hand-pulling, and hand-rogueing; (b) mechanical: clipping, mowing, tilling and burning; (c) cultural: grazing by livestock, tilling, fertilization, seeding of competitive plants, and the use of weed seed-free seed mixes and mulches; (d) biological: use of approved insects and pathogens; and (e) herbicidal: spot treatments, backpack, and ground-based broadcast applications. It is expected that a combination of methods would be used for most treatment programs and the following criteria would be applied: (1) Health and human safety, (2) effectiveness, (3) economic efficiency, and (4) environmental acceptability and compatibility. The annual combination of methods to be used is expected to vary depending on specific conditions. There will be no aerial application of chemicals by either fixed wing or rotary aircraft.

Sites range in size from single plants to populations covering several thousand acres. In most cases, the weed infestations do not involve 100 percent of the ground, so actual control efforts for noxious weeds may be confined to a smaller area than that reflected in the total affected areas.

All treatment methods, supported by research and experience, will be evaluated for the various weed species. At the low end of anticipated treatment acres, roughly 1,500 acres would be a combination of mechanical/herbicidal, 300 acres manual/mechanical, and the remaining 200 acres biological. Conversely, at the high end of the anticipated treatment acres the breakdown would be roughly 7,500 acres mechanical/herbicidal, 1,500 acres manual/mechanical, and 1,000 acres biological. Based on the above-referenced range, it is estimated that, over the planning period, approximately one-to-three percent of the Forests would be treated. Repeated treatments would be necessary for most weed species because seeds in the soil can be viable for five or even ten years. Therefore, recurring treatments would be authorized until the desired control objective is reached.

There are at least five species that have been found adjacent to the forests or within the state although not yet on National Forest System lands. Prevention measures will be considered to keep these species from spreading onto the national forests. However, if these species are eventually found on the Forests, an eradication objective will be considered.

The twenty-one herbicides and four carriers (or additives) that have been approved and documented in the Risk Assessment for Herbicide Use for Regions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10 and on Bonneville Power Administration Sites (1992) will be considered for use. The following herbicides, however, are the primary materials that will be evaluated based on historical usage for noxious weed control programs: chlorsulfuron, clopyralid, 2, 4–D, dicamba, glyhosate, imazapyr, metsulfuron methyl, picloram, sultometuron, sultometuron methyl, and triclopyr. In addition, an analysis of the herbicide, Plateau, for leafy spurge will be made, although a risk assessment for this herbicide is not yet completed.

DATES: The draft environment impact statement is scheduled for publication in November 2001 with the final environmental impact statement with Record of Decision published in March 2002. A project update letter was sent to all interested stakeholders in May 2001.

ADDRESSES: The responsible officials include Eleanor S. Towns, Regional Forester of the Southwestern Region, 333 Broadway SE, Albuquerque, NM 87102 on any decision related to herbicide use in existing or proposed wilderness zones as well as Research Natural Areas, James W. Golden, Forest Supervisor, Coconino National Forest, 2323 E. Greenlaw Lane, Flagstaff, AZ 86004–1810, Corey P. Wong, Acting Forest Supervisor, Kaibab National Forest, 800 South Sixth Street, Williams, AZ 86046, and Michael R. King, Forest Supervisor, Prescott National Forest for treatments outside of Wilderness and Research Natural Areas.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dave Brewer, Interdisciplinary Team Leader at Kaibab National Forest Supervisor's Office, 800 South 6th Street, Williams, AZ 86046–2899 or phone (520) 635–8221 or e-mail to *mailroom_r3_kaibab@fs.fed.us*. Send written comments to the team leader above. The respective staffs will review specific comments targeted to individual Forests. Additional information will be posted on the Kaibab National Forest web page at *www.fs.fed.us/r3/kai*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Each scoping began on August 31, 1998, when a proposed action to control noxious weeds on road corridors through herbicidal means was mailed to concerned citizens, federal and state agencies, as well as environmental organizations identified on the Forests' NEPA mailing lists. Preliminary issues identified by both agency personnel and the analysis of public comments include: (a) Impacts on the health and safety of individuals traveling in zones which have been treated with herbicides, (b) impacts to various management indicator plants and animals as well as threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, (c) the original proposed action, which called for treatments of populations only within major transportation and utility corridors, was too narrow in scope because it did not include known and potential populations outside these zones and new species could not be evaluated or treated, and (d) execution of the proposed action may impact groundwater as well as other municipal supplies, resulting in a decline in water quality.

Based on the preliminary issues, it was apparent that the original proposed

action, which focused strictly on right-of-way corridors, was not going to effectively reduce the spread of noxious weeds. In addition, the health and safety issues related to spraying within major travel zones influenced the agency to develop the current proposal and send it out for additional scoping.

The project area is located throughout the Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott National Forests. The scope of the proposed action is limited to specific control measures on known as well as projected populations within the three national forests.

The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register** on or about June 15, 2001.

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 draft environmental statements 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 draft environmental impact stage but that are not raised until after 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 comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at the time when it can meaningfully consider them 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 the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council of Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

The responsible officials will make the decision on the proposal after considering comments and responses, environmental consequences discussed in the final environmental impact statement, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

Dated: June 7, 2001.

Keith A. Menasco,

Acting Forest Supervisor, Kaibab National Forest.

[FR Doc. 01–15941 Filed 6–25–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Opal Creek Scenic Recreation Area (SRA) Advisory Council; Notice of Meeting

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: An Opal Creek Scenic Recreation Area Advisory Council meeting will convene in Stayton, Oregon on Monday, July 16, 2001. The meeting is scheduled to begin at 6:00 p.m., and will conclude at approximately 8:30 p.m. The meeting will be held in the South Room of the Stayton Community Center located on 400 West Virginia Street in Stayton, Oregon.

The Opal Creek Wilderness and Opal Creek Scenic Recreation Area Act of 1996 (Opal Creek Act) (Pub. L. 104–208) directed the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the Opal Creek Scenic Recreation Area Advisory Council. The Advisory Council is comprised of thirteen members representing state, county and city governments, and representatives of various organizations, which include mining industry, environmental organizations, inholders in Opal Creek Scenic Recreation Area, economic development, Indian tribes, adjacent landowners and recreation interests. The council provides advice to the Secretary of Agriculture on preparation of a comprehensive Opal Creek Management Plan for the SRA, and consults on a periodic and regular basis on the management of the area. The tentative agenda will focus developing standards and guidelines for management of the SRA and discussion of public involvement strategies.

The public comment period is tentatively scheduled to begin at 8:00 p.m. Time allotted for individual presentations will be limited to 3 minutes. Written comments are encouraged, particularly if the material cannot be presented within the time limits of the comment period. Written comments may be submitted prior to the July 16 meeting by sending them to Designated Federal Official Stephanie Phillips at the address given below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For more information regarding this meeting, contact Designated Federal Official Stephanie Phillips; Willamette National Forest, Detroit Ranger District, HC 73 Box 320, Mill City, OR 97360; (503) 854–3366.

Dated: June 20, 2001.

Y. Robert Iwamoto,

Deputy Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 01–15969 Filed 6–25–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Utilities Service

Municipal Interest Rates for the Third Quarter of 2001

AGENCY: Rural Utilities Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of municipal interest rates on advances from insured electric loans for the third quarter of 2001.

SUMMARY: The Rural Utilities Service hereby announces the interest rates for advances on municipal rate loans with interest rate terms beginning during the third calendar quarter of 2001.

DATES: These interest rates are effective for interest rate terms that commence during the period beginning July 1, 2001, and ending September 30, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gail P. Salgado, Management Analyst, Office of the Assistant Administrator, Electric Program, Rural Utilities Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 4024–S, Stop 1560, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250–1560. Telephone: 202–205–3660. FAX: 202–690–0717. E-mail: *GSalgado@rus.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Rural Utilities Service (RUS) hereby announces the interest rates on advances made during the third calendar quarter of 2001 for municipal rate electric loans. RUS regulations at § 1714.4 state that each advance of funds on a municipal rate loan shall bear interest at a single rate for each interest rate term. Pursuant to § 1714.5, the interest rates on these advances are based on indexes published in the ''Bond Buyer'' for the four weeks prior to the fourth Friday of the last month before the beginning of the quarter. The rate for interest rate terms of 20 years or longer is the average of the 20 year rates