Notices

Federal Register
Vol. 61, No. 121
Friday, June 21, 1996

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Notice and Request for Comments on Information Collection for Visitor Information Use Study

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 establish a new information collection. The new collection is necessary to evaluate how agency information services, such as visitor centers, interpretive services, brochures, or informational flyers, are used by visitors to National Forest System lands geographically situated in close proximity to urban communities in southern California. The San Bernardino, Angeles, Los Padres, and Cleveland National Forests are the focus of this information collection. Information also will be collected to determine how people living near National Forest System lands in southern California urban areas get or receive information about the lands. The data will be used to evaluate the accessibility of information about the four forests in these urban communities, the usefulness of the information, the method or media by which the information was received, and the agency's effectiveness in disseminating National Forest System information to southern California urban communities.

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

ADDRESSES: All comments should be addressed to: Forest Service, USDA, Visitor Information Project, Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, 4955 Canyon Crest Dr., Riverside, CA 92507.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. James Absher, Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, at (909) 680–1559.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Description of Information Collection

Title: Visitor Information Use Study.
OMB Number: New.
Expiration Date of Approval: New.
Type of Request: The following describes a new collection requirement and has not received approval by the Office of Management and Budget.

Abstract: The data collected will be analyzed to gain an understanding of how urban residents in southern California, living close to the San Bernadino, Angeles, Los Padres and Cleveland National Forest System lands, get or receive information about recreational opportunities on the lands; about rules governing the lands, such as permits or costs; if residents share the information with others in their communities; and how southern California urban residents utilize the informational dissemination services provided by the agency, such as National Forest System land visitor centers, interpretive services, brochures, or informational flyers.

The data also will be used to identify which agency informational services are utilized by southern California urban residents and sources by which residents get or receive information about National Forest System lands. The data will be evaluated to define agency information dissemination and urban communication patterns: for example, if southern California urban residents share the information they get or receive with other residents in their communities, what their informational source preferences are (newspapers, television, radio, visitor centers, brochures, or flyers), and if there are differences in informational source sharing among culturally diverse user groups.

Southern California urban visitors to National Forest System lands will be mailed a postage-paid survey, which the visitor may fill out and return. Data gathered in this information collection is not available from other sources.

Estimate of Burden: 20 minutes.
Type of Respondents: Individuals and groups visiting National Forest System lands in southern California.
Estimated Number of Respondents: 2,400.
Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 1.
Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 800 hours.

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 shall 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 will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: June 14, 1996.

Mark A. Remers,
Acting Chief.

[FR Doc. 96–15866 Filed 6–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

Southern Region; Revised Land and Resource Management Plan for the Daniel Boone National Forest; Kentucky Counties of Bath, Clay, Estill, Harlan, Jackson, Knox, Laurel, Lee, Leslie, Madison, McCreary, Menifee, Morgan, Owsley, Perry, Powell, Pulaski, Rockcastle, Rowan, Wayne, Whitley, Wolfe

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to 36 CFR 219.10(g), the Regional Forester for the Southern Region gives notice of the agency's intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the revision of the Daniel Boone National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan). According to 36 CFR 219.10(g), Forest Plans are ordinarily revised on a 10–15 year cycle. The existing Daniel Boone National Forest Plan was approved on September 27, 1985.

The agency invites written comments and suggestions within the scope of the analysis described below. In addition, the agency gives notice that a full environmental analysis and decision-making process will occur on the proposal so that interested and affected people are aware of how they may participate and contribute to the final decision.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be received by September 19, 1996. The agency expects to file the draft EIS with the Environmental Protection Agency and make it available for public comment in January 1998. The Agency expects to file the final EIS in July 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to Forest Supervisor, Daniel Boone National Forest, 1700 Bypass Road, Winchester, KY 40391.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kevin Lawrence, Planning Staff Officer, (606) 745–3152.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: The Regional Forester for the Southern Region located at 1720 Peachtree Road, NW, Atlanta, Georgia 30367, is the Responsible Official for this action, and is the deciding official.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose and Need for Action

The purpose and need for this action begins with the requirements of the National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning regulations at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 219. According to 36 CFR 219.10(g), Forest Plans are ordinarily revised on a 10–15 year cycle. The existing Daniel Boone National Forest Plan was approved on September 27, 1985.

The decisions made in a forest plan include:

1. Establishment of the forest-wide multiple-use goals and objectives (36 CFR 219.11(b)).

2. Establishment of forest-wide management requirements (36 CFR 219.13 to 219.27).

3. Establishment of management areas and management area direction management area prescriptions for applying future activities in that management area (36 CFR 219.11(c)).

4. Determination of land that is suitable for the production of timber (16 U.S.C. 1604(k) and 36 CFR 219.14).

5. Establishment of allowable sale quantity for timber (36 CFR 219.16).

6. Establishment of monitoring and evaluation requirements (36 CFR 219.11(d)).

7. Recommendation of roadless areas as potential wilderness areas (36 CFR 219.17).

8. Designation of lands available for oil and gas lease and the leasing decision [36 CFR 228.102(d) and (e)].

During the five-year review of the Forest Plan, monitoring results were evaluated and public comments were reviewed to determine needed changes to the Forest Plan. This review identified several areas which needed attention during the Forest Plan revision. These issues, and other changes in the management situation were identified by the Forest Service and by the public, and form the basis of the preliminary plan decisions to be examined during the revision. These are not necessarily the sole issues which will be evaluated. The Forest Service will consider public comments received on this Notice and during our public involvement period to develop additional topics as needed.

Proposed Action

Initial analysis of the management situation focused on changes that have taken place during the current ten-year planning period. Those changes that seemed to warrant a revision in the Forest Plan were identified and form the basis for the proposed action. The Forest Plan decisions that are proposed to be revised are described as follows:

1. The commitment by the U.S. Forest Service to use an ecological approach to management of the National Forest System was initiated in 1992. The approach includes an added emphasis on the maintenance of ecosystem functions and processes. The current goals and objectives of the Forest Plan do not fully reflect some of the ecosystem functions, processes, and concerns about biological diversity that exist today.

2. Actions have been taken by the Daniel Boone National Forest to better protect sensitive forest resources. Some of these new actions have reduced the ability of the Forest to produce the timber volume yields that were predicted in the Forest Plan. As a result of these actions, timber harvesting has been deferred during some portion of the past planning period on approximately 26% of the land base classified as suitable for timber production. Volume-per-acre yields have also fallen short of previous estimates. Land allocations and timber yields estimates will be re-evaluated in a Forest Plan revision.

3. There is a continuing increase in public concern over the economics of timber management on the National Forests. In an effort to respond to this concern, the Daniel Boone has placed greater emphasis in its decision-making on cost efficiency, sometimes at the expense of meeting all silvicultural objectives. The goals and objectives of the Forest Plan will be revised to clarify the role of timber harvesting as a means of providing timber products and as tool that can be used to enhance or maintain particular ecosystems. Land allocations for timber management suitability will be revised, as necessary, to better reflect the desired cost efficiency of the timber management program.

4. Demand has increased significantly for non-timber special forest products such as ginseng, other medicinal herbs, moss, grapevines, and various shrubs. This increase in demand has potential economic, biological, and management impacts. The Forest Plan goals and objectives, and management area prescriptions will be revised, as necessary, to respond to this demand while maintaining the integrity of ecosystems and other forest resources.

5. Introduced pests and noxious (invasive) species are affecting, or have the potential to affect, the Daniel Boone National Forest. Pests which have had an increased impact during the current planning period include dogwood anthracnose and butternut canker; and pests which appear likely to have an increased impact in the near future include gypsy moth and hemlock wooly adelgid. Forest Plan goals and objectives, and management prescriptions will be revised to provide for management actions that respond to these threats.

6. Although overall recreation use on the Daniel Boone has increased, it has done so at a slower rate than predicted in the Forest Plan. Recreation areas have deteriorated over the past nine years due to changes in use patterns and funding below that needed for full Forest Plan implementation.

The types of recreation uses have changed, with faster growth in horse back riding and off-highway vehicle use, and slower increases in hiking and backpacking, as an example. These changes in recreation use patterns are significantly affecting the resources and the cost of carrying out the recreation program.

The Americans with Disabilities Act provides new standards for improved access to Forest Service facilities. The cost of meeting these standards in existing facilities can be significant, limiting the Forest's ability to complete other maintenance needs.

The goals and objectives, and forest-wide and management area prescriptions will be revised to reflect these changes in recreation demands

and in the cost of meeting the various demands.

7. There is an increase in development, and a change in the type of development, adjacent to the Forest. These changes are affecting the management options available on lands immediately adjacent to the Forest boundary. Forest plan goals and objectives, and management prescriptions will be revised to better reflect the increasing pressures of the urban/rural interface.

8. The current Forest Plan includes standards that provide for the maintenance of water quality and thermal characteristics in flood plains and riparian areas. It does not adequately reflect the habitat characteristics of riparian areas. The Forest Plan will be revised to include standards and guidelines that help ensure the biological and ecological integrity of this resource feature.

9. With the introduction of ecosystem management principles and other changes in the management situation of the Daniel Boone National Forest, the monitoring needs have also changed. The cost of monitoring is also better appreciated by forest managers and planners than it was ten years ago. The Forest Plan monitoring requirements will be revised to address the questions arising from these changed conditions.

10. The Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act (FOOGLRA or the Reform Act of 1987) as an amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, has instituted a different process for mineral leasing. The Secretary of Agriculture was directed to identify the National Forest System lands which would be available for lease and which would be leased. FOOGLRA also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the appropriate stipulations to apply to a lease to protect the surface resources. The Secretary or his/her officers can now make decisions to lease specific lands subject to NEPA compliance and consistency with the Forest Plan. The revision will need to identify the National Forest System lands which may be offered for lease, and Plan standards and guidelines should include the appropriate stipulations to apply to leases to protect the surface resources, and give guidance for making leasing decisions.

Preliminary Issues

The Daniel Boone National Forest intends to reexamine the primary Forest Plan decisions as described above. Associated with the decision to be revised are the following preliminary issues:

1. What actions and land allocations are necessary to insure the biological diversity and sustainability of ecosystems, considering the plant, animal and human interactions?

2. What combination of land allocation, Forest regulations, facilities and services should the National Forest provide to assure public recreational opportunities that provide a minimum of conflict between users, and protect natural resources?

3. What road and trail system is needed on the forest and how should it be managed?

4. What should be the balance of specially designated areas, such as wilderness, zoological and botanical areas, which are needed to conserve unique forest characteristics.

5. Should the Daniel Boone make land allocations and take action to maintain or improve opportunities for hunting and fishing experiences and enjoyment of wildlife?

6. What role should timber harvesting play in ecosystem management, and in contributing to meet the demand for wood fiber by the American public? What economic considerations should be applied?

7. What additional management options, if any, should be used for the extraction of ''miscellaneous forest products'' such as moss, and other plant materials?

8. How should the Daniel Boone manage federally owned minerals?

Possible Alternative Themes

Based upon the above changes in the management situation and the preliminary issues, the following are examples of alternative management themes that could be developed into alternatives:

Theme A

Continue the management allocations, activities, and management direction of the current Forest Plan as amended. This is the ''No Action'' alternative and its consideration is required by the implementing regulations of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). It will serve as a benchmark against which the other alternatives can be compared to better assess their expected effects and how the alternatives address the significant issues.

Theme B

Ecological processes would be allowed to proceed with a minimum of direct human influence. Fluctuations in forest characteristics such as age-class distribution and species composition would be affected primarily by natural disturbance factors such as insects, disease, and fire.

Primitive recreation opportunities would be emphasized. Facilities and developed sites, such as trails, campgrounds, and boat ramps, would be reduced or eliminated. The Forest would be closed to all off-highway vehicles and most existing Forest Service roads would gradually be closed.

There would be no change in the number of legally designated areas such as Wilderness, but the size of some current areas could be increased and the trend would be towards the development of wilderness-like conditions across the Forest.

There would be no active management for game or non-game species or their habitat. Only primitive hunting and fishing facilities and opportunities would be retained.

No harvesting of timber would take place and no extraction of other forest products would be permitted.

Areas of federal minerals not currently under lease would be made unavailable for future leasing.

Theme C

A variety of outputs and opportunities would be provided by the Forest, while management for existing and potential ecosystems would be emphasized to reduce the potential of threatening ecological processes and the viability of plant and animal species.

Existing recreation facilities would be maintained or redesigned to meet changes in demand for specific recreational activities. Cooperators and concessionaires would be used to improve operating efficiencies.

Trails would be maintained to accommodate a mix of trail users and would be closed when necessary to protect other resource values. Forest Service roads would be managed to provide for a balance of public use, administrative access, and protection of natural resources.

There would be no change in the number of legally designated areas, such as Wilderness, but the size of some may increase. More areas would be designated through Forest Plan management direction to better conserve important ecological characteristics.

The existing level of habitat improvements would be maintained. Some adjustments to the design and location of those improvements would be made to increase overall hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing opportunities.

Commercial timber harvesting would continue and be used to both provide wood products to the American people

and as a tool to help ensure the maintenance of biodiversity and long-term sustainability of forest resources. The extraction of other forest products would continue as long as it does not threaten the long-term viability of the resource.

Federal minerals would be made unavailable for lease where unacceptable impacts to surface resources are a likely result.

Theme D

Management of the Forest would emphasize a variety of recreational opportunities to the extent possible, while still providing for the sustainability and diversity of forest ecosystems. Additional recreation facilities and opportunities would be provided to better meet anticipated demand.

Some trails would be modified, and others constructed and maintained, to specifically accommodate off-highway vehicles, horse riders, and mountain bicyclists. Recreation needs would play a greater role in road management decisions, such as road location and design, maintenance level, and whether the road is kept open or closed to public access.

There would be no change in the number of legally designated areas, such as Wilderness, but the size of some may be increased. More areas would be designated through Forest Plan management direction to better conserve important ecological characteristics and to maximize particular recreational opportunities.

The existing level of habitat improvements would be increased, and adjustments in design and location would be made to improvements to increase overall hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing opportunities.

Timber harvesting would be used as a tool to enhance features and characteristics such as visual variety and habitat diversity which are tied to recreational opportunities on the Forest.

The extraction of other forest products would be managed so that it does not threaten the long-term viability of the resource.

Federal minerals would be unavailable for lease where recreational opportunities would be adversely impacted and where unacceptable impacts to surface resources are likely.

Theme E

Ecological processes would be directly influenced to optimize the development of various forest products. The viability of plant and animal species would be considered, only when it is compromised to the extent that the species would require listing as threatened, endangered, or sensitive.

A variety of dispersed and developed recreation opportunities would be provided for, but management would emphasize those uses that produce opportunities for the greatest number of people.

Forest Service roads and trails would be constructed, redesigned, or maintained to provide for the maximum opportunities to use the Forest.

The current legally designated areas, such as Wilderness, would remain unchanged. Current administratively designated areas would be reduced or eliminated to increase the options available for maximum utilization of the forest.

Management would provide for a diversity of ecosystems, but would seek to maximize habitat for game and other high demand species.

Management direction and land allocations would emphasize the production of timber and other forest products as much as is legally feasible.

All federally-owned minerals would be made available for lease with a minimum of constraints.

These themes are offered merely to illustrate the range of alternatives that could be considered in response to the issues associated with the proposed revision. The Forest Service is seeking comment not just on these particular themes but, more importantly, on the individual components of the various themes. The final range of alternatives considered will be based on the final identification of public issues, management concerns, and resource opportunities.

The Forest Service is seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State and local agencies, and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in or affected by the proposed action. This input will be utilized in the preparation of the draft environmental impact statement. Public participation will be solicited by notifying in person and/or by mail, known interested and affected publics. News releases will be used to give the public general notice, and scoping meetings will be conducted.

Public participation will be especially important at several points during the project analysis process. The first point in the analysis is the scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7). The scoping process includes: (1) identifying potential issues (other than those previously described), (2) from these, identifying significant issues to be analyzed in depth, (3) eliminating from detailed study insignificant issues or those which have been covered by prior environmental review, (4) exploring additional alternatives, and (5) identifying potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternative (i.e., direct, indirect, and cumulative effects).

As part of the first step in scoping, a series of public meetings are scheduled to explain the public input and planning process, and provide an opportunity for public input. These meetings will be held at the following locations, with each meeting scheduled from 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.:

Monday, July 15, 1996, Laurel County Courthouse, London, KY.
Wednesday, July 17, 1996, McKee City Hall, MeKee, KY.
Monday, July 22, 1996, Carl D. Perkins Community Center, Morehead, KY.
Tuesday, July 23, 1996, Natural Bridge State Resort Park, Slade, KY.
Wednesday. July 24, 1996, Big Creek Fire Department, Big Creek, KY.
Thursday, July 25, 1996, Whitley City Middle School, Whitley City, KY.
Friday, July 26, 1996, Rural Economic Development Center, Somerset, KY.
Tuesday, August 13, 1996, Fayette County Extension Service, Lexington, KY.
Thursday, August 15, 1996, Ellis Cooperative Extension Building, Burlington, KY.

These meetings will provide information on the purpose and intent of the Forest Plan revision, the Plan revision process and an opportunity for the public to provide input on the scope and need for change in the Forest plan.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency and to be available for public comment by January 1998. At that time, the Environmental Protection Agency will publish a notice of availability of the DEIS in the Federal Register. The comment period on the DEIS will be 3 months from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notices 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 DEIS 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 DEIS stage but that are not raised until after completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) 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 3 month 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 FEIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the DEIS 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 DEIS 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.

After the comment period ends on the DEIS, the comments will be analyzed, considered, and responded to by the Forest Service in preparing the FEIS. The FEIS is scheduled to be completed in June 1998. The Responsible Official will consider the comments, responses, environmental consequences discussed in the FEIS, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making a decision regarding this revision. The Responsible Official will document the decision and reasons for the decision in the Record of Decision. That decision will be subject to appeal in accordance with 36 CFR 217.

The Responsible Official is the Regional Forester, Southern Region, 1720 Peachtree Road, NW, Atlanta, Georgia 30367.

Dated: June 17, 1996.

Gloria Manning,

Deputy Regional Forester, Resources.

[FR Doc. 96–15816 Filed 6–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction; Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir Project

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of joint interchange of lands; correction and republication.

SUMMARY: On April 23, 1996, the Forest Service published a notice in the Federal Register (61 FR 17872) of a joint interchange of lands with the Department of Army. The summary of that notice had two minor errors; additionally, the legal land descriptions (Exhibits A–1 and B–1) were not published with the notice. The agency is republishing the notice to correct these errors.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The order was effectively April 23, 1996, when originally published in the Federal Register.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David M. Sherman, Lands Staff, Forest Service, USDA, Telephone: (202) 205–1362.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 10, 1995, and January 11, 1996, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture respectively signed a joint interchange order agreeing to the transfer or administrative jurisdiction from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Army of 36.286 acres, more or less, lying within the Angelina National Forest in Jasper County, Texas, and from the Department of the Army to the Department of Agriculture of 48.29 acres, more or less, lying within the exterior boundaries of the Sabine National Forest in Sabine County, Texas. As required by the Act of July 26, 1956, Congress received 45 days advance notice of this action.

A copy of the Joint Order, as signed, and the accompanying Exhibits A–1 and B–1 are set out at the end of this notice. Exhibits A and B, references to which are in the Joint Order, are maps that are on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Director, Lands Staff, Forest Service, USDA, 4 South, Auditors Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C.

Dated: June 6, 1996.

Valdis E. Mezainis,

Acting Chief.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Sam Rayburn Reservoir, Texas

Joint Order Interchanging Administrative Jurisdiction of Department of the Army Lands and National Forest Lands

By Virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Army by Public Law 804 dated July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 656; 16 U.S.C. 505a, 505b) it is ordered as follows:

(1) The jurisdiction now held by the Secretary of the Army over the Army lands described in Exhibits A and A–1, attached hereto and made a part hereof, which lands are within the boundaries of the Sabine National Forest, Texas, is hereby transferred from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the Corps of Engineers' full, complete and perpetual right, power, privilege and easement occasionally to overflow, flood and submerge the land described in Exhibits A and A+1 lying below elevation 179′ National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD), and its right to maintain mosquito control as may be required in connection with the construction, operation and maintenance of the Sam Rayburn Reservoir Project, Texas, provided that no structures for human habitation shall be constructed or maintained on said land, and that no other structures shall be constructed or maintained on said land except as may be approved in writing by the representatives of the United States in charge of the Project, and that no excavation shall be conducted and no landfill placed on the land without such approval as to the location and method of excavation and/or placement of landfill, provided further that any use of the land shall be subject to Federal and State laws with respect to pollution.

(2) The jurisdiction now held by the Secretary of Agriculture over the National Forest lands described in Exhibits B and B–1, attached hereto and made a part hereof, which are a part of the Angelina National Forest, Texas, is hereby transferred from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Army, subject to continued access thereover by the Forest Service as may be necessary for National Forest purposes.

(3) Pursuant to Section 2 of the aforesaid Act of July 26, 1956, the National Forest lands transferred to the Secretary of the Army by this order are hereafter subject only to the laws applicable to the Department of the Army lands comprising the Sam Rayburn Reservoir Project, Texas. the Department of the Army lands transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture by this order are hereby subject to the laws applicable to lands acquired under the Act of March 1, 1911 (38 Stat. 961), as amended, in addition to the laws applicable to the Department of Army necessary to provide for flood control as specified in paragraph 1 of this Order. Pursuant to authority contained in section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1911, the Secretary of Agriculture hereby orders that those lands transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be administered as a