Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended (7 U.S.C. 136 *et seq.*). FIFRA requires that all pesticides, including herbicides, be registered prior to distribution or sale, unless exempt by EPA regulation. In cases in which genetically modified plants allow for a new use of an herbicide or involve a different use pattern for the herbicide, EPA must approve the new or different use. Accordingly, a submission has been made to EPA for registration of the herbicide glufosinate for use on sugar beet. When the use of the herbicide on the genetically modified plant would result in an increase in the residues of the herbicide in a food or feed crop for which the herbicide is currently registered, or in new residues in a crop for which the herbicide is not currently registered, establishment of a new tolerance or a revision of the existing tolerance would be required. Residue tolerances for pesticides are established by EPA under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), as amended (21 U.S.C. 301 *et seq.*), and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) enforces tolerances set by EPA under the FFDCA.

FDA published a statement of policy on foods derived from new plant varieties in the **Federal Register** on May 29, 1992 (57 FR 22984–23005). The FDA statement of policy includes a discussion of FDA's authority for ensuring food safety under the FFDCA, and provides guidance to industry on the scientific considerations associated with the development of foods derived from new plant varieties, including those plants developed through the techniques of genetic engineering. AgrEvo has begun consultation with FDA on the subject sugar beet.

In accordance with § 340.6(d) of the regulations, we are publishing this notice to inform the public that APHIS will accept written comments regarding the Petition for Determination of Nonregulated Status from any interested person for a period of 60 days from the date of this notice. The petition and any comments received are available for public review, and copies of the petition may be ordered (see the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice).

After the comment period closes, APHIS will review the data submitted by the petitioner, all written comments received during the comment period, and any other relevant information. Based on the available information, APHIS will furnish a response to the petitioner, either approving the petition in whole or in part, or denying the petition. APHIS will then publish a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing the regulatory status of AgrEvo's event T120–7 sugar beet and the availability of APHIS' written decision.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 150aa–150jj, 151–167, and 1622n; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(c).

Done in Washington, DC, this 2nd day of February 1998.

Craig A. Reed,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 98–3048 Filed 2–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Young'n Timber Sales, Willamette National Forest, Lane County, OR

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) on a Proposed Action to harvest and regenerate timber, and thin young stands created by past regeneration harvest. This EIS was triggered during an environmental analysis (EA) which discovered a potential for significant impacts as defined under NEPA 1508.27. The proposed action also calls for the construction, reconstruction, decommissioning of roads, restoration of degraded stream channels, improvement of big game forage, and other habitat restoration projects within the Middle Fork drainage of the Willamette River watershed. The planning area is bisected by the Middle Fork of the Willamette River. The west side of the planning area is bounded by Forest Road 5850, Forest Road 2125 forms the south boundary, and Snow Creek forms the north boundary. On the east side of the planning area, Warner Mountain, Logger Butte, and Joe's Prairie border the east and north side of the planning area, and the Young's Rock Trail borders the southern end of the planning area. The area is approximately 57 air miles southeast of the City of Eugene and 12 air miles south of the City of Oakridge. The Forest Service proposal will be in compliance with the 1990 Willamette National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan as amended by the 1994 Northwest Forest Plan, which provides the overall guidance for management of this area. These proposals are tentatively planned for implementation in fiscal years 1999–2001.

The Willamette National Forest invites written comments and suggestions on the scope of the analysis in addition to those comments already received as a result of local public participation activities. The agency will also give notice of the full environmental analysis and decision-making process so that interested and affected people are made aware as to how they may participate and contribute to the final decision.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope and implementation of the analysis should be received in writing by March 1, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments and suggestions concerning the management of this area to Rick Scott, District Ranger, Rigdon Ranger District, Willamette National Forest, P.O. Box 1410, Oakridge, Oregon 97463.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Direct questions about the proposed action and the scope of analysis to Kristie Miller, Planning Resource Management Assistant or John Agar, Project Coordinator, Rigdon Ranger District, phone 541–782–2283.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Young'n Planning area is entirely within the Middle Fork of the Willamette River watershed. A Watershed Analysis was completed for the Middle Fork of the Willamette River in August, 1995, titled; the Middle Fork Willamette River Downstream Tributaries Watershed Analysis Report.

The purpose of this project is to harvest timber in a manner that implements the Forest Plan management objectives and Watershed Analysis recommendations.

The proposal includes harvesting timber in four to five separate timber sales, over the next three years. Up to four sales would involve regeneration harvest and one sale would involve commercial thinning. Both thinning and regeneration harvest timber sale proposals would involve road construction, reconstruction, and decommissioning. This analysis will evaluate a range of alternatives addressing the Forest Service proposals to harvest approximately 20.5 million board feet; approximately 1.1 million board feet would be generated from thinning some 218 acres of young managed stands created by past clearcut harvest, and approximately 19.4 million board feet would be generated by regeneration harvest on approximately 580 acres. All the above proposed harvest would require a total of 2.7 miles of temporary road construction and 40 miles of road reconstruction.

The Young'n planning area comprises about 38,000 acres; of this total, 4,122 (11%) acres are private land. Of the 33,878 acres of Forest Service land, about 15,313 acres (45%) have been previously harvested and regenerated. Of the remaining acres, approximately 1,850 (5.4%) acres is in a mature stand condition, ranging in ages from 70 to 170 years, and 16,700 acres is in an old-growth stand condition, stand ages exceeding 200 years. The planning area contains about 1,536 acres (4%) of non-forested vegetation types and rock outcrops. Management areas that provide for programmed timber harvest are Scenic (11a, 11c, 11d) and General Forest (14a). Other land allocations in this planning area are Late-Successional Reserves (16A, 16B), Riparian Reserves (15A), Wild and Scenic River Corridor, and the Moon Point Special Interest Area (5A).

The project area does not include any inventoried roadless area.

Preliminary issues identified in this analysis are potential impacts to habitat of plant and animal communities, landscape connectivity and wildlife dispersal corridors, watershed restoration opportunities, cumulative watershed effects, scenic quality along the Middle Fork of the Willamette River, forest growth and yield, and economics.

Scoping was initiated again in April of 1996. Alternatives were developed and preliminary analysis was completed during the summer and fall of 1997. The developed alternatives consisted of: (A) optimization of growth and yield while meeting Forest Plan Standard and Guidelines Thresholds, (B) conservation of habitat while exceeding current Forest Plan Standard and Guidelines (C) blend alternative; optimization of growth and yield and conserve the most functional habitats while meeting Forest Plan Standard and Guidelines (D) No Action. Alternative A would treat 902 acres and generate 24.5 MMBF of timber volume, Alternative B would treat 709 acres and generate 18.1 MMBF of timber volume, Alternative C would treat 790 acres and generate 20.5 MMBF of timber volume, and Alternative D No Action would defer harvest in this planning area. All action alternatives were developed to avoid forest fragmentation and system road construction. Results of the above actions, documented in an environmental analysis, indicated a potential for significant effects to the human environment, hence the need for documentation with an Environmental Impact Statement.

The Forest Service will be seeking additional information, comments and assistance from Federal, State, local agencies, tribes, and other individuals or organizations who may be interested or affected by the proposed project. Additional input will be used to help verify the existing analysis and determine if additional issues and alternatives should be developed. This input will be used in preparation of the draft EIS.

The scoping process will include the following:

- Identification of potential issues;
- Identification of issues to be analyzed in depth;
- Elimination of insignificant issues or those which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental process;
- Exploration of additional alternatives based on the issues identified during the scoping process; and
- Identification of potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternatives (i.e. direct, indirect, and cumulative effects and connected actions).

The draft EIS is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review by March, 1998. The comment period on the draft EIS will be for a 45 day period, following the date the EPA publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register.**

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, a reviewer 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,* 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 substantive comments and objectives 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 statement. 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 June, 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. Rick Scott, District Ranger, is the responsible official and as responsible official, he will document the Young'n Timber Sales and connected actions and rational in a Record of Decision. That decision will be subject to Forest Service Appeal Regulations (36 CFR Part 215).

Dated: January 28, 1998.

Rick Scott,

District Ranger.

[FR Doc. 98–2975 Filed 2–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

ASSASSINATION RECORDS REVIEW BOARD

Addition of Routine Use to Privacy Act Systems of Records

AGENCY: Assassination Records Review Board.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(11), the Assassination Records Review Board is issuing notice of our intent to amend the systems of records entitled the Personnel Files (ARRB–9) and the Time and Attendance Files (ARRB–14) to include a new routine use. The disclosure is required by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, Pub. L. 104–193. We invite public comment on this publication.

DATES: Persons wishing to comment on the proposed routine use must do so by March 9, 1998.

Effective date: The proposed routine use will become effective as proposed without further notice on March 9, 1998, unless comments dictate otherwise.