

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 those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate 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 will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: December 15, 1995.

David G. Unger,
Associate Chief.

[FR Doc. 95-31022 Filed 12-20-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Extension of Currently Approved Information Collection for Baseline and Trend Information on Wilderness Use and Users

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent; request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Forest Service announces its intent to extend a currently approved information collection of questions and sampling alternatives used to develop baseline and trend information about the changing role of wilderness in rural communities and the behavior of urban residents who visit wilderness for recreation, education programs, or scientific study.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing on or before February 20, 1996.

ADDRESSES: All comments should be addressed to: Alan Watson, Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, Forest Service, USDA, P.O. Box 8089, Missoula, MT 59807.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alan Watson, Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, (406) 542-4197.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Description of Information Collection

The currently approved information collection comprises a pool of questions and sampling alternatives (for example, on-site surveys and mailback questionnaires); the following describes the information collection to be extended:

Title: Baseline and Trend Information on Wilderness Use and Users.

OMB Number: 0596-0108.

Expiration Date of Approval: May 31, 1996.

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

Abstract: The Wilderness Act (Pub. L. 88-577) directs that wilderness be managed to preserve natural conditions and to provide outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation. To make informed decisions on appropriate management methods that mediate recreational users' impact on natural resources and on other visitor experiences, Forest Service and other Federal land managers need information on visitors' behavior in the area, their preferences for various types of social interaction, and their support for various management strategies. It is difficult for wilderness managers to obtain accurate information on these topics because information currently available is limited to only a few wilderness areas. Established baselines and monitoring trends for visitor characteristics, behavior, and preferences throughout the country are needed by Federal agencies managing wilderness, including the Forest Service and the USDI National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Fish and Wildlife Service. The Forest Service has been using the previously approved collection of questions and sampling alternatives to establish baselines, monitor trends, and provide input to forest planning activities at several wildernesses managed by the agency.

Estimate of Burden: The response time is likely to vary from 3 to 5 minutes to respond to on-site surveys and from 15 to 20 minutes to complete mailback questionnaires.

Type of Respondents: Visitors to units of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,000 per year for 3 years.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 1.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 410 hours.

Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (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 through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information.

Use of Comments

All comments received in response to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: December 15, 1995.

David G. Unger,

Associate Chief.

[FR Doc. 95-31023 Filed 12-20-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for Land Use Authorization for Lakewood Raw Water Pipeline; Roosevelt National Forest, Boulder County, CO

AGENCY: Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

ACTION: Notice of Intent to Prepare Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: The Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests and Pawnee National Grassland is proposing to issue an easement to the City of Boulder Colorado to cross 5 miles of National Forest System lands with a replacement pipeline. The easement would allow the City to replace, maintain and operate Lakewood Pipeline. The pipeline is a raw water transmission line used to transport municipal water nine miles from Lakewood Reservoir to Betasso Water Treatment Plant. The City proposes to install the replacement pipeline in the vicinity of the 1906 pipeline, with some specific deviations to avoid potentially adverse impacts to environmentally sensitive areas. The proposal is for a 27- to 33-inch inside-diameter steel pipeline to be buried with a minimum of 4 feet of cover.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be received in writing by January 20, 1996. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be published mid-February, 1996 for a 45-day comment period. The final Environmental Impact Statement will be issued at the end of June 1996.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: The Regional Forester, Region 2 Rocky Mountain Region, will be the responsible official and will decide whether to grant an easement for a pipeline on National Forest System lands and at what location.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Submit written comments, suggestions and questions to: Jean Thomas, Project Coordinator; Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests; 240 West Prospect; Fort Collins Colorado 80526; 970-498-1267.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The City of Boulder is proposing to maintain the historical water delivery function of the Lakewood Pipeline facility. Continued operation to serve this function will require reconstruction of the facility. The City's proposal consists of installing the replacement pipeline in the vicinity of the 1906 pipeline, with some specific deviations to avoid potentially adverse impacts to environmentally sensitive areas. The City will restore, to the extent reasonably possible, the contours and vegetation on National Forest System lands, estimated to be 18 acres, and the private lands, estimated to be 25 acres, along the Pipeline corridor. The City will require access to the pipeline for repair and maintenance.

The existing Lakewood Pipeline must be replaced because air entrainment, caused by the current pipeline, reduces the Betasso Water Treatment Plant's capability to remove drinking water contaminants. New stricter drinking water standards have been adopted by the EPA. The City will not meet the new standards based on water tests performed under current operating conditions. Also, the pipeline interior lining is deteriorating and collecting in the pipeline low points, restricting the flow in the pipeline. This has reduced the pipeline's capacity from the historical rate of 20 million gallons per day (mgd) to 14 mgd.

The Forest Service is considering analyzing five alternatives in the Lakewood Raw Water Pipeline Environmental Impact Statement. (1) A No Action Alternative, where the Forest Service would not authorize the use of National Forest System lands for the pipeline. The City would not be required to remove the existing pipeline because removal would create undesirable environmental impacts. (2) A Cleaning and Relining Alternative which entails refurbishing the existing pipeline, and reducing air entrainment to Betasso Water Treatment Plant through the use of vacuum deaeration equipment. (3) Sugarloaf Road or a Pump-Driven Replacement Pipeline alternative. The objective of the Sugarloaf Road Alternative is to confine pipeline construction to established road corridors, thereby avoiding the potential environmental effects from construction disturbance along the existing pipeline and North Boulder Creek, but would require pumping. (4) The Existing Pipeline Alignment is the City of Boulder's proposed action. This alternative closely follows the existing and 1906 Lakewood Pipeline alignment along North Boulder Creek. (5) Peewink Alignment—Gravity-Fed Replacement Pipeline. This alternative seeks to

address concerns regarding impacts to the North Boulder Creek riparian zone and to reduce pumping and traffic concerns associated with the Sugarloaf Road alternative.

Lakewood Pipeline reconstruction has been considered since 1988. Over the years both the City of Boulder and the Forest Service have asked the public to express their concerns and issues. The primary concerns are about impacts of reconstruction to aquatic and riparian ecosystems in North Boulder Creek if the pipeline follows the historical right-of-way, or concerns for personal safety and convenience if Sugarloaf Road is closed for periods of time for construction along the road. The environmental analysis will also address impacts to air, soils, forested and nonforested terrestrial ecosystems, recreation and visual resources, cultural resources and private properties and residents.

The Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests and Pawnee National Grassland intend to publish the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for public comment in mid-February, 1996. The Comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the Federal Register.

The Forest Service believes, 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 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. versus NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental impact statement 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 versus Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. versus 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 participated 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 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 as 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

The Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests and Pawnee National Grassland intend to issue the final Environmental Impact Statement the end of June 1996.

Dated: December 13, 1995.

M.M. Underwood, Jr.,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 95-31070 Filed 12-20-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Natural Resources Conservation Service

Hickory Creek Watershed, Newton County, Missouri; Finding of No Significant Impact

AGENCY: Natural Resources Conservation Service.

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 Hickory Creek Watershed, Newton County, Missouri.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roger A. Hansen, State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Parkade Center Suite 250, 601 Business Loop 70 West, Columbia, Missouri, 65203, (314) 876-0901.

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, Roger A. Hansen, State