

Toiyabe National Forest Schedule of Proposed Actions since April of 2005. In 2005 the Forest Service received scoping responses, including letters from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Nevada Historic Preservation Office, Nevada Department of Wildlife and Western Watersheds Projects. Comments were also received from Elko County Commissioners and Elko County Roads Department. Relevant responses were used to synthesize and develop issues. There are currently no scoping meetings planned for the EIS.

### Preliminary Issues

The following are the significant issues identified through the analysis conducted to date. We are asking you to help us further refine the existing issues, as well as identify other issues or concerns relevant to the Proposed Action.

**Water Quality**—Drilling and associated activities could result in (1) Cross contamination of aquifers by providing conduits; (2) impacts to existing engineered mine features (embankments); (3) interactions and effects to water quality; and (4) increased sedimentation and erosion from ground disturbing activities.

**Water Quantity and Flows**—Drilling through geologic structures can intercept aquifers and alter groundwater flow.

**Wildlife**—Exploration activities have the potential to disrupt seasonal use by a variety of wildlife species (mule deer, sage grouse, various raptors and other species) in and around the project area, and to affect quality and quantity of habitat for these species.

**Special Status Species (Wildlife)**—Proposed surface disturbance and human activity associated with exploration activities may cause short- and long-term adverse effects to habitats used by Northern goshawk, sage-grouse, neo-tropical migratory birds, pygmy rabbit, and several species of bats with potential to occur in the Project area.

**Special Status Species (Aquatics and Fisheries)**—Increased sediment from disturbance by the proposed exploration could adversely affect threatened Lahontan cutthroat trout and Columbia spotted frog (candidate species), which inhabit the North Fork Humboldt River.

**Recreation**—Exploration activities and effects including noise, increased traffic on the access road, and road maintenance could affect recreation opportunities and the quality of the recreational experience.

**Livestock**—Surface disturbance would alter the vegetation, which has the potential to change the carrying capacity

within the pasture in both the short-term and long-term.

**Vegetation**—Surface disturbance may (1) Affect specific plant communities, such as aspen, riparian vegetation and sub-alpine fir; (2) promote the spread and establishment of noxious weeds, such as hoary cress and Canada thistle, and other non-native invasive species, and (3) affect sensitive plants).

Other issues that will also be addressed in the analysis include the potential impacts this project may have on the McAfee Peak Inventoried Roadless Area which is partly within the project area. As proposed a small amount of exploration activities would be within this roadless area. Approximately 12 drill sites and less than 1,000 feet to the drill road are located slightly within or on the northern boundary of the McAfee Peak Inventoried Roadless Area. The portion of the roadless area impacted is a small “finger” that was created through a mapping error in 1998/1999 when the latest inventory for roadless areas was adopted. This is the inventory that was made part of the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule. This finger in question has reclaimed mining and exploration roads within its boundaries and lacks roadless characteristics. This type of activity fits within an exemption category for allowing road construction within the IRA tied to outstanding or existing valid rights. Because no portion of the project area within or adjacent to the McAfee IRA exhibits roadless characteristics, effects of the Proposed Action upon the McAfee IRA have not been identified as a significant issue.

### Comment Requested

This NOI continues the scoping process which will guide the development of the Environmental Impact Statement. The public is invited to submit scoping comments, stating concerns and issues relevant to the proposed project. These comments will be used to help establish the scope of study and analysis for the EIS.

### Early Notice of Importance of Public Participation in Subsequent Environmental Review

A draft EIS will be prepared for comment. The comment period on the draft EIS will be 45 days from the date that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) publishes the notice of availability (NOA) in the **Federal Register**.

The Forest Service believes that, 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 EISs 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 have been 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*, 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 45 day comment period so that comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can consider them and respond to them in a meaningful manner within the final EIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns regarding the Proposed Action, comments on the draft EIS should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if the comments refer to specific pages, sections, or chapters of the draft document. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft EIS or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the document. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Comments received, including the names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record of this proposal and will be available for public inspection

(Authority: 40 CFR 1501.7 and 1508.22; Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, Section 21)

Dated: June 27, 2007.

**Edward C. Monnig,**

*Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 07-3307 Filed 7-6-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Glenn/Colusa County Resource Advisory Committee

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Glenn/Colusa County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC)

will meet in Willows, California. Agenda items covered include: (1) Introductions, (2) Approve Minutes, (3) Public Comment, (4) Project Proposals/Possible Action, (5) Status of Funding, (6) Reports on Completed Projects, (7) General Discussion, (8) Next Agenda.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held on July 23, 2007, from 1:30 p.m. and end at approximately 4:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Mendocino National Forest Supervisor's Office, 825 N. Humboldt Ave., Willows, CA 95988. Individuals who wish to speak or propose agenda items send their names and proposals to Eduardo Olmedo, DFO, 825 N. Humboldt Ave., Willows, CA 95988.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bobbin Gaddini, Committee Coordinator, USDA, Mendocino National Forest, Grindstone Ranger District, P.O. Box 164, Elk Creek, CA 95939. (530) 968-1815; e-mail [ggaddini@fs.fed.us](mailto:ggaddini@fs.fed.us).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The meeting will be open to the public. Committee discussion is limited to Forest Service staff and Committee members. However, persons who wish to bring matters to the attention of the Committee will file written statements with the Committee staff before or after the meeting. Public input sessions are provided and individuals who made written requests by July 19, 2007 have the opportunity to address the committee at those sessions.

Dated: June 27, 2007.

**Eduardo Olmedo,**

*Designated Federal Official.*

[FR Doc. 07-3308 Filed 7-6-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Natural Resources Conservation Service

#### Rehabilitation of Multiple Purpose Dam No. 3 of the Muddy Fork of the Illinois River Watershed, Washington County, Arkansas

**AGENCY:** Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of a Finding of No Significant Impact.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR Part 1500); and the Natural Resources Conservation Service Regulations (7 CFR Part 650); the Natural Resources Conservation Service,

U.S. Department of Agriculture, gives notice that an environmental impact statement is not being prepared for the rehabilitation of Multiple Purpose Dam No. 3 of the Muddy Fork of the Illinois River Watershed, Washington County, Arkansas.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kalven L. Trice, State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Rm. 3416 Federal Building, 700 West Capital Avenue, Little Rock, AR 72201-3225, Telephone (501) 301-3100.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The environmental assessment of this federally assisted action indicates that the project will not cause significant local, regional, or national impacts on the environment. As a result of these findings, Kalven L. Trice, State Conservationist, has determined that the preparation and review of an environmental impact statement is not needed for this project.

The project will rehabilitate Multiple Purpose Dam (MPD) No. 3 to maintain the present level of flood control, fish habitat and recreational benefits and comply with the current dam safety and performance standards. Local Sponsoring Organizations for the rehabilitation of MPD No. 3 are the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission and Washington County Conservation District.

Rehabilitation of MPD No. 3 will require the dam to be modified to meet current performance and safety standards for a high hazard dam. The modification will consist of:

- The existing principal spillway inlet and conduit are adequate. The principal spillway crest will be maintained at Elevation 1169.3, the current permanent pool elevation.
- Increasing spillway capacity by the addition of a 100-foot wide RCC structural spillway over the top of dam to supplement the existing 110-foot wide vegetated auxiliary spillway, with the crest elevation of both spillways set at Elevation 1175.3 feet, the current elevation for the vegetated spillway.
- Raising the top of dam and dike (located northwest of the pool area) from Elevation 1179.0 feet to Elevation 1181.9 feet to safely pass the 6-hour to 72-hour duration Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP) storms.

All disturbed areas will be planted to plants that have wildlife values. The proposed work will not affect any prime farmland, endangered or threatened species, wetlands, or cultural resources.

Federal assistance will be provided under authority of the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Amendments of 2000 (Section 313, Pub. L. 106-472). Total

project cost is estimated to be \$1,429,900, of which \$1,019,600 will be paid from the Small Watershed Rehabilitation funds and \$410,300 from local funds.

The notice of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) has been forwarded to the Environmental Protection Agency and to various Federal, State, and local agencies and interested parties. A limited number of copies of the FONSI are available to fill single copy requests at the above address. Basic data developed during the environmental assessment are on file and may be reviewed by contacting Kalven L. Trice, State Conservationist.

No administrative action on implementation of the proposal will be taken until August 8, 2007.

Dated: June 28, 2007.

**Kalven L. Trice,**

*State Conservationist.*

[FR Doc. E7-13226 Filed 7-6-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-16-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Natural Resources Conservation Service

#### Notice of Proposed Changes to the Natural Resources Conservation Service's National Handbook of Conservation Practices

**AGENCY:** Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), U.S. Department of Agriculture.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of proposed changes in the NRCS National Handbook of Conservation Practices for public review and comment.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given of the intention of NRCS to issue a series of new or revised conservation practice standards in its National Handbook of Conservation Practices. These standards include: "Agrichemical Handling Facility (Code 309)" (This is a new standard), and "Fence (Code 382)" (This is an existing standard that has been updated). NRCS State Conservationists who choose to adopt these practices for use within their States will incorporate them into Section IV of their respective electronic Field Office Technical Guides (eFOTG). These practices may be used in conservation systems that treat highly erodible land or on land determined to be a wetland.

**EFFECTIVE DATES:** Comments will be received for a 30-day period commencing with this date of publication. Final versions of these new or revised conservation practice standards will be adopted after the close