The Daily Spectrum, St. George, Utah

Fishlake National Forest

Fishlake Forest Supervisor decisions:
Richfield Reaper, Richfield, Utah
Loa District Ranger decisions:
Richfield Reaper, Richfield, Utah
Richfield District Ranger decisions:
Richfield Reaper, Richfield, Utah
Beaver District Ranger decisions:
Richfield Reaper, Richfield, Utah
Fillmore District Ranger decisions:
Richfield Reaper, Richfield, Utah

Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forests

Humboldt Forest Supervisor decisions:
Elko Daily Free Press, Elko, Nevada
Toiyabe Forest Supervisor decisions:
Reno Gazette-Journal, Reno, Nevada
Sierra Ecosystem Coordination Center (SECO):
Carson District Ranger decisions:
Reno Gazette-Journal, Reno, Nevada
Bridgeport District Ranger decisions:
The Review-Herald, Mammoth Lakes, California
Spring Mountains National Recreation Area Ecosystems (SMNRAE):
Spring Mountain National Recreation Area District Ranger decisions:
Las Vegas Review Journal, Las Vegas, Nevada
Central Nevada Ecosystems (CNECO):
Austin District Ranger decisions:
Reno Gazette-Journal, Reno, Nevada
Tonopah District Ranger decisions:
Tonopah Times Bonanza-Goldfield News, Tonopah, Nevada
Ely District Ranger decisions:
Ely Daily Times, Ely Nevada
Northeast Nevada Ecosystem (NNECO):
Mountain City District Ranger decisions:
Elko Daily Free Press, Elko, Nevada
Ruby Mountains District Ranger decisions:
Elko Daily Free Press, Elko, Nevada
Jarbidge District Ranger decisions:
Elko Daily Free Press, Elko, Nevada
Santa Rosa District Ranger decisions:
Humboldt Sun, Winnemucca, Nevada

Manti-Lasal National Forest

Manti-Lasal Forest Supervisor decisions:
Sun Advocate, Price, Utah
Sanpete District Ranger decisions:
The Pyramid, Mt. Pleasant, Utah
Ferron District Ranger decisions:
Emery County Progress, Castle Dale, Utah
Price District Ranger decisions:
Sun Advocate, Price, Utah
Moab District Ranger decisions:
The Times Independent, Moab, Utah
Monticello District Ranger decisions:
The San Juan Record, Monticello, Utah

Payette National Forest

Payette Forest Supervisor decisions:
Idaho Statesman, Boise, Idaho
Weiser District Ranger decisions:
Signal American, Weiser, Idaho
Council District Ranger decisions:
Council Record, Council, Idaho
New Meadows, McCall, and Krassel District Ranger decisions:
Star News, McCall, Idaho

Salmon and Challis National Forests

Salmon Forest Supervisor decisions:
The Recorder-Herald, Salmon, Idaho
Cobalt District Ranger decisions:
The Recorder-Herald, Salmon, Idaho
North Fork District Ranger decisions:
The Recorder-Herald, Salmon, Idaho
Leadore District Ranger decisions:
The Recorder-Herald, Salmon, Idaho
Salmon District Ranger decisions:
The Recorder-Herald, Salmon, Idaho
Challis Forest Supervisor decisions:
The Challis Messenger, Challis, Idaho
Middle Fork District Ranger decisions:
The Challis Messenger, Challis, Idaho
Challis District Ranger decisions:
The Challis Messenger, Challis, Idaho
Yankee Fork District Ranger decisions:
The Challis Messenger, Challis, Idaho
Lost River District Ranger decisions:
The Challis Messenger, Challis, Idaho

Sawtooth National Forest

Sawtooth Forest District Ranger decisions:
The Times News, Twin Falls, Idaho
Burley District Ranger decisions:
Ogden Standard Examiner, Ogden, Utah for those decisions on the Burley District involving the Raft River Unit.
South Idaho Press, Burley, Idaho for decisions issued on the Idaho portions of the Burley District.
Twin Falls District Ranger decisions:
The Times News, Twin Falls, Idaho
Ketchum District Ranger decisions:
Wood River Journal, Hailey, Idaho
Sawtooth National Recreation Area:
Challis Messenger, Challis, Idaho
Fairfield District Ranger decisions:
The Times News, Twin Falls, Idaho

Targhee National Forest

Targhee Forest Supervisor decisions:
The Post Register, Idaho Falls, Idaho
Dubois District Ranger decisions:
The Post Register, Idaho Falls, Idaho
Island Park District Ranger decisions:
The Post Register, Idaho Falls, Idaho
Ashton District Ranger decisions:
The Post Register, Idaho Falls, Idaho
Palisades District Ranger decisions:
The Post Register, Idaho Falls, Idaho
Teton Basin District Ranger decisions:
The Post Register, Idaho Falls, Idaho

Uinta National Forest

Uinta Forest Supervisor decisions:
The Daily Herald, Provo, Utah
Pleasant Grove District Ranger decisions:
The Daily Herald, Provo, Utah
Heber District Ranger decisions:
The Daily Herald, Provo, Utah, and *Wasatch Wave,* Heber City, Utah
Spanish Fork District Ranger decisions:
The Daily Herald, Provo, Utah

Wasatch-Cache National Forest

Wasatch-Cache Forest Supervisor decisions:
Salt Lake Tribune, Salt Lake City, Utah
Salt Lake District Ranger decisions:
Salt Lake Tribune, Salt Lake City, Utah
Kamas District Ranger decisions:
Salt Lake Tribune, Salt Lake City, Utah
Evanston District Ranger decisions:
Uintah County Herald, Evanston, Wyoming
Mountain View District Ranger decisions:
Uintah County Herald, Evanston, Wyoming
Ogden District Ranger decisions:
Ogden Standard Examiner, Ogden, Utah
Logan District Ranger decisions:
Logan Herald Journal, Logan, Utah

Dated: April 15, 1997.

Jack G. Troyer,

Deputy Regional Forester.

[FR Doc. 97–10792 Filed 4–25–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

I–90 Land Exchange, Wenatchee National Forest, Kittitas County, Washington; Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, King and Pierce Counties, Washington; and Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Cowlitz, Lewis, and Skamania Counties, Washington

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) to develop and evaluate a range of alternatives for a land exchange that involves approximately 43,000 acres of Plum Creek Timber Company, Limited Partnership land and 41,000 acres of National Forest System land. The values of the lands exchanged must be equal. The alternatives will be developed with the emphasis on social, economic and ecological values. It is believed that the integrity of these

values will be improved by reducing fragmentation that is created by the current ownership pattern. This proposal is scheduled for completion no later than October 1998.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope and implementation of this proposal must be received by June 1, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions and comments about this EIS should be directed to Floyd Rogalski, Project Planner, Cle Elum Ranger District, 803 West Second Street, Cle Elum, Washington 98922; phone 509–674–4411, ext. 315.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Forest Service is initiating this action in response to a request by Plum Creek to exchange lands that will provide public benefits while improving management opportunities. Lands with high wildlife, aquatic and recreation values are proposed to be exchanged for lands more suitable to timber management. Also being considered is the opportunity to consolidate lands into more easily managed contiguous blocks.

Issues that have been identified to date include: (1) The impact of providing contiguous blocks of National Forest land on a landscape where much of the land is fragmented by a ''checkerboard'' pattern of ownership; (2) spectrum of recreational opportunities, regardless of ownership, continue to exist; (3) the impact on the economies of the affected counties; (4) the impact to cultural and historic sites; and (5) tribal concerns.

The decision to be made is what lands, if any, should be exchanged as part of this proposal. The proposed action is to analyze whether to exchange approximately 41,000 acres of National Forest System land for 43,000 acres of Plum Creek land, adjusted for equal value as required by law. Other alternatives will be developed during the scoping process for the environmental impact statement.

All alternatives will need to respond to the specific condition of providing benefits equal to or better than the current condition. Alternatives being considered at this time include: (1) No Action and (2) Exchanging lands as identified in the proposed action.

Public participation will be especially important at several points during the analysis. The Forest Service will be seeking information, comments, and assistance from the Federal, State, and local agencies, and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in or affected by the proposed action. This information will be used in preparation of the draft EIS. The scoping process includes:

1. Identifying potential issues.
2. Identifying issues to be analyzed in depth.
3. Eliminating insignificant issues or those which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental process.
4. Exploring and identifying additional alternatives.
5. Identifying potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternatives (i.e. direct, indirect, and cumulative effects and connected actions).
6. Determining potential cooperating agencies and task assignments. Public meetings will be held in both eastern and western Washington, Notice of meeting dates and locations will be published in the newspapers of record. Wenatchee National Forest—*The Wenatchee World* and *The Yakima Herald-Republic*; Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest—*Seattle Post-Intelligencer;* and Gifford Pinchot National Forest—*Columbian*.

At this time, the scoping meetings are planned to be held in April and May 1997. The scheduled meeting dates are as follows: April 30, Hal Holmes Center, Ellensburg, Washington, 6–9 p.m.; May 1, Holiday Inn, Issaquah, Washington, 6–9 p.m.; May 7, Randle Ranger Station, Randle, Washington, 6–9 p.m.; and May 8, Mt. St. Helens Visitor Center, Castle Rock, Washington, 6–9 p.m.

The draft EIS is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review by December, 1997. 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 notice appears in the **Federal Register**. At that time, copies of the draft EIS will be distributed to interested and affected agencies, organizations, and members of the public for their review and comment.

It is very important that those interested in the management of the Gifford Pinchot, Mr. Baker-Snoqualmie, and Wenatchee National Forests participate at that time. 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 a draft EIS 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 EIS stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final EIS may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon* v. *Hodel,* 803f. 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 a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final EIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft EIS should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft EIS. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft EIS or the 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 final EIS is scheduled to be completed in October 1998. 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 the decision regarding this proposal.

Judith E. Levin, Acting Director of Recreation, Lands and Mineral Resources, Pacific Northwest Region is the responsible official. As the responsible official she 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: April 21, 1997.

Judith E. Levin,

Acting Director of Recreation, Lands, and Mineral Resources.

[FR Doc. 97–10825 Filed 4–25–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Business-Cooperative Service

Notice of Request for Extension of a Currently Approved Information Collection

AGENCY: Rural Business-Cooperative Service, USDA.