available to the Forest Service at a 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 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 Beaverhead-Deerlodge Forest Supervisor is the responsible official who will make the decision. She will decide on this proposal after considering comments and responses, environmental consequences discussed in the Final EIS, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies. The decision and reasons for the decision will be documented in a Record of Decision.

Dated: August 17, 1998.

Deborah L.R. Austin,

Forest Supervisor, Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest.

[FR Doc. 98–22734 Filed 8–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Upper Charley Subwatershed Ecosystem Restoration Projects Umatilla National Forest, Garfield County, 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) on a proposed action to implement ecosystem restoration projects, designed to promote healthy watershed conditions, within the Upper Charley subwatershed. The project area is located on the Pomeroy Ranger District approximately 10 air miles southeast of Pomeroy, Washington.

Proposed project activities consist of in-channel fish habitat projects, hydrologic stability projects (road obliteration, road re-alignment/reconstruction), wildlife enhancement projects, range improvements, noxious weed treatments, recreation opportunities, landscape prescribed fire, and restoration of forest stand structure/composition using a variety of silvicultural treatments including commercial timber harvest. The proposed action is designed to reduce risks to ecosystem sustainability, prevent further degradation of forest health, reduce risks of catastrophic wildfire, improve or maintain aquatic and terrestrial habitat, manage access to protect wildlife, and provide some economic return to local economies.

The EIS will tier to the 1990 Land and Resource Management Plan FEIS for the Umatilla National Forest, which provides overall guidance for forest management of the area.

DATES: Written comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be received on or before September 24, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments and suggestions to the Responsible Official, Monte Fujishin, District Ranger, Pomeroy Ranger District, 71 West Main Street, Pomeroy Washington, 99347.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randall Walker, Project Team Leader, Pomeroy Ranger District. Phone: (509) 843–1891.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The decision area contains approximately 7,650 acres within the Umatilla National Forest in Garfield County, Washington. It is within the boundary of the Upper Charley subwatershed of the Asotin watershed. The legal description of the decision area is as follows: Sections 11–14, 22–28, and 33–36 Township 9 North, Range 42 East; and Sections 8, 17–20 and 30 Township 9 North, Range 43 East, and Sections 3 and 4 Township 8 North, Range 42 East, W.M. surveyed. All proposed activities are outside the boundaries of any roadless or wilderness areas.

Fish habitat projects include in-channel restoration, pond construction, and stabilization of streambanks. Proposed hydrologic stability projects include 14.04 miles of road obliteration, 13 miles of road realignment/reconstruction, and revegetation of cut and fill slopes. Snag creation, construction of cisterns for non-big game species and prescribed burning for elk habitat are proposed to enhance wildlife habitat. Noxious weed treatments to help restore biodiversity and productivity of native plant species are also included in the proposed action. A variety of silvicultural methods would treat approximately 4,492 acres within the area. Approximately 4.3 miles of temporary road construction is proposed to access timber harvest areas (all temporary roads would be obliterated following completion of sale activities), and approximately 7.71 miles of existing non-system roads would be added to the transportation system for future project use. This proposal also includes prescribed burning within harvest units (3,554 acres) and outside of harvest units (2,000 acres) to reduce the potential for future wildfires, prepare sites for regeneration, enhance wildlife habitat and maintain forest health by bringing fuel levels closer to their historic levels.

An estimated 18.2 million board feet of timber would be commercially harvested on approximately 3,554 acres. Proposed silvicultural treatments are briefly described as follows:

Precommercial Thinned: Saplings would be thinned to a tree per acre variable spacing to promote growth and provide a sustainable species composition. This treatment is proposed on 938 acres.

Thin from Below: Thinning of stand to recommended stocking level (listed by residual square feet of basal area per acre). This would be accomplished by leaving the largest and healthiest trees on each microsite. This treatment is proposed on 885 acres.

Uneven-aged Management: Stand densities would be reduced to 60–100 square feet of basal area per acres by removing the least vigorous trees greater than 7 inches DBH. This treatment is proposed on 2,176 acres.

Shelterwood Group Selection: Windfirm trees favoring western larch and ponderosa pine would be retained as groups and individuals. Openings from one-half to four acres would occur in areas of insect and disease pockets and low vigor fir thickets. This treatment is proposed on 493 acres.

For all harvest treatments existing snags and large down wood would be left on site. Ponderosa pine and western larch would be the preferred species for leave trees. All trees greater than 21 inches DBH would be left in the ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir biophysical groups (both are below their historic range of variability). Thinning of saplings would occur after harvest.

The proposed action will tier to the FEIS and Umatilla Forest Plan, as amended, which provides goals, objectives, standards, and guidelines for the various activities and land allocations on the forest. In the project/analysis area there are eight designated management areas (MAs): A6, A9, C1, C3, C3A, C4, C5 and E2. Management area A6–Developed Recreation is managed to provide recreation opportunities that are dependent on the

development of structural facilities for user convenience (no timber harvest is allowed). A9–Special Interest Area is managed to preserve and interpret areas of significant cultural, historical, geological, botanical, or other special characteristics for educational, scientific and public enjoyment purposes (no timber harvest allowed). C1–Dedicated Old Growth is managed to provide and protect sufficient suitable habitat for wildlife species dependent upon mature and/or overmature forest stands and promote a diversity of vegetative conditions for such species (no timber harvest allowed). C3–Big Game Winter Range is managed to provide high levels of potential habitat effectiveness and high quality forage for big game species (timber harvest is allowed). C3A–Sensitive Big Game Winter Range is managed to provide high levels of potential habitat effectiveness (timber harvest allowed only under catastrophic conditions). C4–Wildlife Habitat is managed to provide high levels of potential habitat effectiveness for big game and other wildlife species with emphasis on size and distribution of habitat components (timber harvest is allowed). C5–Riparian is managed to maintain or enhance water quality, and produce a high level of potential habitat capability for all species of fish and wildlife within the designated riparian habitat areas while providing for a high level of habitat effectiveness for big game (limited timber harvest is allowed). E2–Timber and Big Game is managed to emphasize production of wood fiber (timber), encourage forage production, and maintain a moderate level of big game and other wildlife habitat (timber harvest is allowed). Timber harvest for the proposed action would only take place in management areas C3 and E2.

The Forest Service will consider a range of alternatives. One of these will be the ''no action'' alternative in which none of the proposed activities would be implemented. Additional alternatives will examine varying levels and locations for the proposed activities to achieve the proposal's purposes, as well as to respond to the issues and other resource values.

Preliminary Issues: Tentatively, the preliminary issues identified are briefly described below:

1. Wildlife Habitat—What effects would timber harvest and prescribed burning have on big game and non-game habitat?

2. Ecosystem Sustainability—How would the proposed activities effect ecosystem sustainability and forest health?

3. Air Quality—What effects would landscape prescribed burning have on air quality?

4. Water Quality/Riparian Habitat—How would water quality, flow, temperature, timing and riparian habitat conditions be effected by the proposed activities?

5. Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive (TES) Species—What effect will the proposed activities have on TES species and what opportunities exist to improve habitat?

6. Road Management—What opportunities exist to obliterate roads and reduce road density in the subwatershed?

7. Noxious Weeds—What effects would the proposed activities have on noxious weed populations?

This list will be verified, expanded, or modified based on public scoping and interdisciplinary review of this proposal.

Public participation will be especially important at several points during the analysis, beginning with the scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7). Initial scoping began with the project listing in the 1997 Winter Edition of the Umatilla National Forest's Schedule of Proposed Actions. A public meeting will be scheduled for September, 1998 to discuss the project, other meetings will be scheduled as needed. This environmental analysis and decision making process will enable additional interested and affected people to participate and contribute to the final decision. The public is encouraged to take part in the process and is encouraged to visit with Forest Service officials at any time during the analysis and prior to the decision. The Forest Service will be seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, local agencies, and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in, or affected by the proposal. This input will be used in preparation of the Draft EIS. The scoping process includes:

1. Identifying potential issues.

2. Identifying major issues to be analyzed in depth.

3. Identifying issues which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental analysis.

4. Considering additional alternatives based on themes which will be derived from issues recognized during scoping activities.

5. Identifying potential environmental effects of this project 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 to the public for review by January, 1999. At that time, the 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 publishes the Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register**. It is important that those interested in the management of the Umatilla National Forest participate at that time.

The Final EIS is scheduled to be completed by May, 1999. 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 a decision regarding the proposal.

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 Draft EIS's must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts the 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 objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider 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 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 Forest Service is the lead agency. Monte Fujishin, District Ranger, is the Responsible Official. As the Responsible Official, he will decide which, if any, of

the proposed projects will be implemented. He 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: August 17, 1998.

Monte Fujishin,

District Ranger.

[FR Doc. 98–22736 Filed 8–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

USDA, Forest Service, USDI, National Park Service; Notice of Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Coconino National Forest and Walnut Canyon National Monument

SUMMARY: The Forest Service previously had administrative jurisdiction over 1,279 acres, more or less, as depicted on the map entitled, ''Boundary Proposal—Walnut Canyon National Monument,'' numbered 360/80,010, and dated September 1994. The National Park Service formerly had administrative jurisdiction on 54 acres, more or less, as shown on the same map. Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 208 of Pub. L. 104–333, 110 Stat. 4093, administrative jurisdiction on the 1,279 acres is now in the National Park Service, and administrative jurisdiction on the 54 acres is now in the Forest Service. Both transfers are subject to prior existing rights and applicable laws and regulations. The specific lands and/or interests, subject to this notice, include both the surface and minerals on 1,279 acres, more or less, and 54 acres, more or less.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The maps and other documents associated with this transfer of lands and minerals may be reviewed at the Intermountain Land Resources Program Center, 1220 South St. Francis Drive, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504, and at Walnut Canyon National Monument Headquarters, 6400 North Highway 89, Flagstaff, Arizona 86004. The same materials are available at the USDA, Forest Service, Regional Office, 517 Gold Avenue, SW, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102, and Coconino National Forest, 2323 Greenlaw Lane, Flagstaff, Arizona 86004.

Dated: May 5, 1998.

Eleanor Towns,

Regional Forester, USDA, Forest Service, Region 3.

Dated: July 17, 1998.

John E. Cook,

Regional Director, Intermountain Region, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 98–22723 Filed 8–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce (DOC) has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Agency: Bureau of Export Administration (BXA).

Title: Approval of Triangular Involving Commodities Covered by a U.S. Import Certificate.

Agency Form Number: None.

OMB Approval Number: 0694–0009.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection of information.

Burden: 1 hour.

Average Time Per Response: 30 minutes per response.

Number of Respondents: 1.

Needs and Uses: The triangular symbol will be stamped on the certificate as notification to the government of the exporting country that the U.S. importer is uncertain whether the items will be imported into the U.S. or knows that the items will not be imported into the U.S., but that, in any case, the items will not be delivered to any other destination except in accordance with the EAR. This procedure was developed in an effort to increase the effectiveness of controls over international trade in strategic commodities, ensuring that they will not be delivered to any other destination except in accordance with export control regulations.

Affected Public: Individuals, businesses or other for-profit institutions.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

OMB Desk Officer: Victoria Baecher-Wassmer (202) 395–5871.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier, DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482–3272, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to Victoria Baecher-Wassmer, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: August 18, 1998.

Linda Engelmeier,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–22726 Filed 8–24–98; 8:45 a.m.]

BILLING CODE 3510–33–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce (DOC) has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 USC Chapter 35).

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Title: Northeast Region—Gear Identification Requirements.

Agency Form Number(s): None.

OMB Approval Number: None.

Type of Request: New collection.

Burden: 24,518 hours.

Number of Respondents: 3,253 (multiple requirements).

Avg. Hours Per Response: One minute to mark gear.

Needs and Uses: This collection is under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The regulations specify that federal permit holders using specified fishing gear be marked with the vessels official identification number, Federal permit number, tag number, or some other specified form of identification. The regulations further specify how the gear is to be marked (e.g., location and visibility). This information is used for enforcement purposes and for the identification of gear concerning damage loss or civil proceedings.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit organization, individuals.

Frequency: Recordkeeping.

Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.

OMB Desk Officer: David Rostker, (202) 395–3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier, DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482–3272, Department of Commerce,