

grazing permits and assign grazing privileges to permittees having a corporate or partnership interest in the grazing permit. The information identifies the portion of the interest an entity has in the corporation or partnership holding the grazing permit.

Estimate of Burden: 20 minutes.

Type of Respondents: Individuals applying for or holding a grazing permit.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 300.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 1.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 100 hours.

Description of Information Collection

The following information describes the information collection to be extended:

Title: R3-FS-2200-1; Annual Validation of Term Grazing Permit.

OMB Number: 0596-0003.

Expiration Date of Approval: April 30, 1999.

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

Abstract: The data is necessary for annual confirmation that the permittee intends to use the grazing permit and the extent to which they plan to use it. It also can be used as a request for changes to a grazing permit. Information collected on this form enables the agency to bill for fees due the Federal Government and to recommend and approve changes from the current year's permitted use.

Estimate of Burden: 30 minutes.

Type of Respondents: Permittees holding a grazing permit.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1000.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 1.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 500 hours.

Description of Information Collection

The following information describes the information collection to be extended:

Title: R8-2200-23; Application for Validation of Term Grazing Permit.

OMB Number: 0596-0003.

Expiration Date of Approval: April 30, 1999.

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

Abstract: The data is necessary for the annual confirmation the permittee intends to use the grazing permit and the extent to which they plan to use it. It also can be used as a request for changes to a grazing permit. Information collected on this form enables the

agency to bill for fees due the Federal Government and to recommend and approve changes from the current year's permitted use.

Estimate of Burden: 30 minutes.

Type of Respondents: Permittees holding a grazing permit.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 400.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 1.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 200 hours.

Comments Are Invited

The agency invites comments on the following: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Use of Comments

All comments received in response to this notice, including name and address when provided, will be summarized and included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: April 14, 1999.

Robert Lewis, Jr.,

Deputy Chief, Research.

[FR Doc. 99-9686 Filed 4-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Cannon/Mittersill Land Exchange; White Mountain National Forest, Grafton County, NH

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) for a proposed land exchange between the State of New Hampshire and the Forest Service. The State would acquire approximately 160

acres of National Forest System land near the top of the former Mittersill Ski Area. In exchange, the State would give to the Forest Service a portion of the Second Presidential Tract, located about 5 miles south of Cannon Mountain in the town of Lincoln. In addition, the State desires a Special Use Permit for the operation and maintenance of the Tucker Brook Trail, within its existing footprint. No additional access or ski lifts are proposed for this trail.

The Mittersill parcel proposed for exchange is composed largely of land designated by the Forest Service as Management Areas (MAs) 7.1 and 9.2 (approximately 52 and 132 acres, respectively). MA 7.1 is managed for the development of alpine ski terrain and associated year-round recreation while MA 9.2 is land that is reserved for future ski area expansion. Both management areas have been used for skiing since the early 1930's. Approximately 6 acres of the proposed Mittersill exchange parcel is designated as MA 6.2, which is managed for semi-primitive, non-motorized recreation. This small piece of MA 6.2 is included in the proposed exchange to fulfill a Forest Plan land adjustment objective of achieving "more efficient land ownership patterns".

The Second Presidential Tract was acquired by the State of New Hampshire Department of Transportation to facilitate the extension of I-93 through Franconia Notch. The original acquisition contained about 1,665 acres and was part of a much larger tract, the rest of which (4,565 acres) was previously transferred to the United States of America for addition to the WMNF. Approximately 346 acres of the northern portion of the Second Presidential Tract was transferred to the Department of Resources and Economic Development and incorporated into Franconia Notch State Park to compensate for land taken from the park for construction of the Franconia Notch Parkway. An additional 159 acres was utilized by the Department of Transportation for the I-93 right-of-way. The remaining 1,160 acres are available for consideration in the land exchange.

Portions of the state-owned Second Presidential Tract were recommended for possible Forest Service acquisition in the 1986 WMNF Plan. This tract contains significant natural resources including Georgiana Falls, several significant wetlands and relatively mature hard- and softwood forests. The parcel also serves as the visual foreground for the Blue Ridge-Mount Kinsman Area of the Forest which includes a significant portion of the Appalachian Trail. Although owned by the State of New Hampshire, the Second

Presidential Tract remains under the administrative jurisdiction of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation.

The State of New Hampshire proposes to exchange a portion of the Second Presidential Tract with the Forest Service for 190 acres at the top of the Mittersill Ski Area. It is further proposed that the exchange parcel be taken from the northern end of the Tract (bounded by Franconia State Park to the north and the WMNF to the west) in an amount that may equal up to 125% of the value of the Mittersill parcel. The exchange parcel would likely contain Georgiana Falls. Values of the exchange parcels would be determined by appraisers acceptable to both the State of New Hampshire and the Forest Service.

DATES: The agency must receive comments on or before May 19, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments and suggestions concerning the scope of the analysis to Anne Archie, District Ranger; White Mountain National Forest; Ammonoosuc/Pemigewasset Ranger District; RFD 3, Box 15, Route 175; Plymouth, New Hampshire 03264.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions regarding the proposed action, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and/or the forthcoming EIS should be directed to Anne Davy, NEPA Coordinator; White Mountain National Forest; Ammonoosuc/Pemigewasset Ranger District; FRD 3, Box 15, Route 175; Plymouth, New Hampshire 03264. Phone: 603-536-1315; fax: 603-536-3281; e-mail: adavy/r9_whitemtn@fs.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose and Need for the Proposal

The New Hampshire State Legislature recently mandated that a new Master Development Plan (MDP) be prepared for Cannon. The new MDP has been completed and accepted by the Cannon Mountain Advisory Commission, the Department of Parks and Recreation (which operates Cannon), the Capitol Budget Overview Committee, and the Governor and Executive Council. This MDP recommended three phases of development, all of which involve upgrading lifts, expanding and improving existing terrain and upgrading service facilities, consistent with the development philosophy for Cannon.

Phase III involves the restoration and reopening of the Mittersill Ski Area. Because expansion opportunities are limited on the Cannon portion of the resort, redevelopment of Mittersill is

part of the plan to offer new and exciting terrain to the skiing public. Optimal development of Mittersill would require use of National Forest System lands. Although it would be possible to redevelop the Mittersill area entirely on State lands, it is not desirable for the following reasons:

1. The historic ski trails on National Forest System lands are not maintained for public use. For example, the Taft Trail, which was one of the first ski racing trails in North America and provides an upper mountain connection between Cannon and Mittersill, is highly desirable to reestablish and maintain.

2. Redevelopment of Mittersill entirely on State lands would reduce the amount of new terrain that could be created to about 60% of what is presented in the new MDP.

3. Cannon is deficient in intermediate terrain at present and development of more of this terrain is needed to meet the skiing and riding needs of the public. The Mittersill area offers the greatest potential for intermediate terrain development, but only by utilizing National Forest System land. If National Forest System lands can not be used, the redeveloped Mittersill area on State land would be for advanced and expert skiers only. Cannon Mountain would remain deficient in intermediate terrain.

With respect to the Tucker Brook Trail, the Forest Service does not currently operate or maintain this trail and has no plans to do so in the future. The State believes this trail has historic significance, and for this reason, proposes to assume control of the trail. Since this trail is within the National Forest and is not part of the proposed land exchange, a Special Use Permit is needed.

Consistency With National Forest Policy/White Mountain National Forest Plan

Land exchanges have played an important role in facilitating land acquisitions in National Forests since passage of the General Exchange Act of 1922. Other pieces of important enabling Federal legislation include the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, the National Forest Management Act of 1976 and the Federal Land Exchange Facilitation Act of 1988. The purpose of the 1988 legislation was to "facilitate and expedite land exchanges pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and other laws applicable to exchanges involving lands managed by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture". Among other things, this act's findings include a declaration from Congress that "land exchanges are a very important tool for Federal and State land managers and private landowners to consolidate Federal, State and private holdings of land or interests

in land for purposes of more efficient management and to secure important objectives including the protection of fish and wildlife habitat and aesthetic values; the enhancement of recreation opportunities; the consolidation of mineral and timber holdings for more logical and efficient development; the expansion of communities; the promotion of multiple-use values; and fulfillment of public needs". This act further recognized that the "needs for land ownership adjustments and consolidation consistently outpace available funding for land purchases by the Federal Government and thereby make land exchanges an increasingly important method of land acquisition and consolidation for both Federal and State land managers and private landowners".

The Forest Plan for the WMNF also recognizes land adjustments, either by purchase or exchange, as important tools for achieving management goals for the National Forest. The plan states that "Land adjustments (purchase or exchange) will satisfy one or more of the following purposes:

- To accomplish objectives of public law or regulation;
- To meet demand for National Forest System resources;
- To achieve more efficient land ownership patterns;
- To achieve lower resource management costs; and
- To obtain needed access to National Forest System lands."

In short, Federal legislation gives the Forest Service broad discretionary power to pursue land exchanges while the Forest Plan specifies the criteria to be satisfied when considering land acquisition. The Forest Service believes that the proposed land exchange between the State of New Hampshire and the Forest Service meets all five criteria cited above. Therefore, the Forest Service has concluded that it is in the public interest to pursue the proposed project.

NEPA Process

The Forest Service has adopted a rigorous process of environmental review and analysis, pursuant to NEPA regulations, for all activities on National Forest System lands that have potential environmental impact. This process includes extensive public involvement, beginning with scoping early in the process and concluding with public review of final environmental documents and Forest Service decisions. Public participation is an important part of the analysis, commencing with the initial scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7), which will

occur upon publication of this notification. The Forest Service will be seeking information, comments and assistance from Federal, State and local agencies and other individuals or organizations that may be interested in or affected by the proposed action. The proposed project will be presented at an Open House in the local area, where representatives from the WMNF and the State of New Hampshire will be available to discuss the project and provide additional information. In addition, interested parties are encouraged to visit with Forest Service officials at any time during the analysis and prior to the decision.

Comments from the public and other agencies will be used in preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Please note that comments will be regarded as public information. The scoping process will be used to:

1. Identify potential issues.
2. Identify major issues to be analyzed in depth.
3. Eliminate minor issues or those which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental analysis, such as the Forest Plan EIS for the WMNF.
4. Identify alternatives to the proposed action.
5. Identify potential environmental effects of the proposed action and its alternatives, including direct, indirect and cumulative effects.
6. Determine potential cooperating agencies and task assignments.

No significant issues associated with the proposed land exchange or the Special Use Permit for the Tucker Brook Trail have been identified to date. Issues commonly associated with land exchanges of public lands are usually specific to the lands involved but often include methods of determining appropriate values of the parcels involved and potential impacts to threatened, endangered or sensitive species.

In preparing the DEIS, the Forest Service will consider a range of alternatives to meet the objectives of this proposal. One of these will be the "no action" alternative, in which none of the proposed activities would be implemented. Additional alternatives may involve issuance of a Special Use Permit instead of a land exchange and/or evaluation of parcels of land other than that already identified that might better meet the management objectives for the WMNF.

The DEIS will analyze the direct, indirect and cumulative environmental effects of the alternatives. Past present and foreseeable future activities on private, State and National Forest System lands will be considered. The

DEIS will also discuss site-specific mitigation measures, if necessary, that may be required to implement the project and their anticipated effectiveness.

It is expected at this time that the DEIS will be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and made available for public review in December 1999. At that time, the EPA will publish a Notice of Availability of the DEIS in the **Federal Register**. The comment period on the DEIS will be 45 days from the date the EPA's notice of availability appears in the **Federal Register**. It is very important that those interested in management of the WMNF and Cannon Mountain participate during this review and comment period. To be most helpful, comments on the DEIS should be as specific as possible. The Final EIS (FEIS) is expected to be released in March of 2000.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, that 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 impact 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. Natural Resources Defense Council*, 435 US 519, 558 (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 scoping and 45-day DEIS comment periods 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 developing issues and alternatives.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues on the proposed action, comments should be as specific as possible. 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.

Dated: April 13, 1999.

Donna Hepp,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 99-9665 Filed 4-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

Designation for the Central Illinois (IL) Area

AGENCY: Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA).

ACTION: Notice; correction.

SUMMARY: The Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration published a document in the **Federal Register** of April 1, 1999, announcing designation of Central Illinois Grain Inspection, Inc. (Central Illinois), to provide official services under the United States Grain Standards Act. The document contained an incorrect date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Janet M. Hart, 202-720-8525.

Correction

In the **Federal Register** of April 1, 1999, in FR Doc. 99-7995, on page 15723, in the third column, correct the fifth paragraph to read:

Effective June 1, 1999, and ending March 31, 2002, Central Illinois is designated to provide official services in the Central Illinois geographic area specified in the October 1, 1998, **Federal Register**.

Authority: Pub. L. 94-582, 90 Stat. 2867, as amended (7 U.S.C. 71 *et seq.*).

Dated: April 13, 1999.

Neil E. Porter,

Director, Compliance Division.

[FR Doc. 99-9637 Filed 4-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-EN-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Natural Resources Conservation Service

Nutrient Management Technical Assistance Activities Policy; Revision

AGENCY: Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), USDA

ACTION: Revision of the NRCS policy for nutrient management technical assistance activities. This revised policy impacts the NRCS national conservation practice standards for Nutrient Management (Code 590) and Waste Utilization (Code 633), which have been revised and reissued to reflect the new policy.
