a history of double-cropping in each of the last four years;

(F) For which planting history or conservation plans indicate that the acreage would have remained fallow for crop rotation purposes.

(v) For the purpose of determining eligible acreage for prevented planting coverage, acreage for all units will be combined and be reduced by the number of acres of the insured crop timely planted and late planted. For example, assume you have 100 acres eligible for prevented planting coverage in which you have a 100 percent share. The acreage is located in a single FSA Farm Serial Number which you insure as two separate optional units consisting of 50 acres each. If you planted 60 acres of the insured crop on one optional unit and 40 acres of the insured crop on the second optional unit, your prevented planting eligible acreage would be reduced to zero (i.e., 100 acres eligible for prevented planting coverage minus 100 acres planted equals zero).

(5) In accordance with the provisions of section 7 (Report of Acreage) of the Basic Provisions, you must report by unit any insurable acreage that you were prevented from planting. This report must be submitted on or before the acreage reporting date. For the purpose of determining acreage eligible for a prevented planting unit revenue guarantee the total amount of prevented planting and planted acres cannot exceed the maximum number of acres eligible for prevented planting coverage. Any acreage you report in excess of the number of acres eligible for prevented planting coverage, or that exceeds the number of eligible acres physically located in a unit, will be deleted from your acreage report.

Signed in Washington, D.C. on June 16, 1997.

Kenneth D. Ackerman,

Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

[FR Doc. 97–16272 Filed 6–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Spruce Ecosystem Recovery Project, Dixie National Forest, Iron and Kane Counties, Utah

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of Intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Forest Service, USDA, will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Forest Service to implement several proposals within the Spruce Ecosystem Recovery Project area, on the Cedar City Ranger District, Dixie National Forest. These proposals include: (1) Commercial salvage, sanitation and density management timber harvest, and associated road construction/closures; (2) commercial and non-commercial regeneration treatments of aspen forests; (3) the establishment of defensible fire suppression zones; and, (4) management ignited prescribed fire. Multiple decisions may be issued upon completion of the analysis; however, the cumulative effects of all the proposed actions will be disclosed in the EIS. The purpose of these proposals is to initiate actions that would improve forest health and diversity, accelerate reforestation, and meet woody debris objectives within the project area. The project area is located approximately 15 miles east of Cedar City, Utah. The project would be implemented in accordance with direction in the Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP, 1986) for the Dixie National Forest.

In addition to the management activities proposed to be implemented, an amendment to the LRMP is being proposed. This amendment is necessary in order to make the LRMP conform to the Regional Guide. The amendment is described below under Supplementary Information.

The agency gives notice that the environmental analysis process is underway. During the analysis process, an issue surfaced that warranted disclosure of effects under an EIS. This issue is the high degree of interest associated with the potential to alter the undeveloped character of a portion of the project area due to proposed road construction and vegetable management treatments.

Interested and potentially affected persons, along with local, state, and other federal agencies, are invited to participate in, and contribute to, the environmental analysis. The Dixie National Forest invites written input regarding issues specific to the proposed action.

DATES: Written comments to be considered in the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) should be submitted by July, 1997, which is at least 30 days following the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register.** The DEIS is expected to be available for review by August, 1997. The Record of Decision and Final Environmental Impact Statement are expected to be available by October, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to: District Ranger, Cedar City Ranger District, 82 North 100 East, P.O. Box 627, Cedar City, Utah 84721–0627; FAX: (801) 865–3791; E-mail: Brunswick__Nancy/r4__dixie@fs.fed.us.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Direct questions about the proposed action and EIS to Phillip G. Eisenhauer, Project Environmental Coordinator, by mail at 82 North 100 East, P.O. Box 627, Cedar City, Utah 84721–0627; or by phone at (801) 865–3700; FAX: (801) 865–3791; E-mail: Brunswick__Nancy/r4__dixie@fs.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed projects are located in an analysis area of about 48,274 acres of National Forest System (NFS) lands. Approximately 24,926 acres of the project area are forested and 13,348 acres are non-forest. The proposed commercial conifer treatment areas were recently or are currently infested with spruce beetle (*Dendroctonus rufipennis*). Spruce beetle populations are at epidemic levels; they have killed thousands of spruce trees, on approximately 7,400 acres on the Cedar City Ranger District. In some sites where spruce was the dominant overstory, few live trees remain. Because spruce beetle populations have been expanding since the early 1990's, an additional 15,000 acres of spruce forest are at risk of beetle infestation.

The purpose of the project is to salvage the dead and dying Engelmann spruce and subalpine fir trees to recover wood products that would otherwise be lost, while still meeting desired resource objectives for standing dead and down tree material. Also, spruce dominated stands that are classified as moderate risk to spruce beetle infestation would be treated by commercial and non-commercial sanitation treatments to alter the forest conditions that contribute to this risk. These stands were previously thinned with an even aged silvicultural system to a residual basal area of about 130 square feet. Reducing the risk in these stands would provide the best opportunity to maintain a green, forested condition as well as maintain important resource values associated with maintaining spruce forests, such as old growth, wildlife habitat, and scenic quality near vistas and along scenic highway corridors.

More specifically, sanitation treatments would involve the removal of uninfested conifer trees of varying sizes in order to alter forest densities, species composition, and size class. Currently, stands in the moderate risk class contain about 130 square feet of basal area per

acre. These treatments would involve reducing the overall stand basal area per acre (all species) to 100 square feet or less. This will reduce risk of future infestation by bark beetles.

Rehabilitation of areas heavily impacted by bark beetle mortality through the completion of natural and artificial regeneration activities would occur as needed. An estimated 585 acres will be artificially regenerated. Reforestation is essential to providing for the most rapid progression toward the desired future condition for forest cover in the project area.

In addition to commercial and non-commercial treatments, and related rehabilitation treatments, wildland fuel reduction treatments are proposed in areas where fuel loadings exceed levels necessary to meet desired fire suppression objectives. Treatments proposed include management ignited prescribed fire and the establishment of Defensible Fire Suppression (DFS) Zones. Both treatments are intended to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire, especially in wildland-urban interface areas.

The use of prescribed fire would occur within two areas in the project area. One area is located in the Center Creek drainage and the other in the Hancock Peak Roadless Inventory Area. The purpose of the reintroduction of fire is to reduce loadings, to create diversity in the landscape vegetation, and reduce the risk of catastrophic fire.

DFS Zones would be established along the perimeter of the Meadow Lake subdivision. Where fuel conditions in this location currently meet the desired conditions, no treatments would occur. DFS Zones are created by implementing fuel ladder (vertical continuity of fuels from ground level to the forest crowns) and fuel loading reduction treatments; that is, thinning all species of vegetation in order to reduce the probability of crown fires carrying through these Zones. The treatments would include the use of commercial and non-commercial tree removal, chipping, hand and machine piling and burning of piles; and broadcast burning of fuels. The DFS Zones would be between 100 to 300 feet wide depending upon the vegetation, fire occurrence, and topography, and would be located entirely on NFS lands. It is estimated that the number of acres proposed for establishment of DFS Zones would not exceed 50 acres.

Regeneration treatment of aspen forests is also included in this proposal. Treatments would include both commercial harvest and non-commercial site preparation (i.e.; cut and burn, broadcast burn). About 8,176 acres of forest are dominated by aspen in the project area. Most are being converted to conifers by natural succession and the lack of fire in the ecosystem. Most vegetation management treatments would lead to an increase in the abundance of aspen, which is the desired goal for resource values identified in the project area (i.e.; wildlife habitat improvement, vegetation diversity, and visual variety and color in the landscape). Up to 1,000 acres would be regenerated over the next five-year period.

Vegetation management treatments involving salvage/sanitation, density management, aspen regeneration, prescribed fire, and establishment of DFS Zones would occur on National Forest lands located within portions of Sections 28–33 of Township(T) 35 South(S), Range(R) 8 West(W); Sections 3–17, 20–24, 26–35 of T.36 S., R8 W.; Sections 3–10, 15–21, 30–32 of T.37 S., R.8. W.; Sections 1, 2, 11–14, 23–26, 35–36 of T.37 S., R.8½ W.; Sections 1–6, 8–15, 24–25 and 36 of T.36 S., R.9 W.; Sections 10–16, 22–27, 35–36 of T.37 S., R.9 W.; Salt Lake City (SLC) Meridian, Iron County, UT; Sections 1–2 of T.38 S., R.9 W.; and Sections 5–6 of T.38 S., R.8W., SLC Meridian, Kane County, UT.

The transportation system required to access commercial harvest areas is largely in place. However, to access all identified moderate to high risk stands, about five miles of temporary and specified road construction would be required. The specified road construction is proposed to occur in an area having undeveloped character.

All newly constructed temporary roads would be obliterated upon completion of the project, and any new permanent or systems road would be physically closed. In addition, approximately eight miles or existing roads that would be used or are located within treatment areas would be closed upon completion of project activities to meet the desired condition for other resources.

In addition to the vegetation management treatments, and related activities, and amendment to the Dixie National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan is being proposed.

Size of Created Openings

Proposed changes to DNF–LRMP Management Direction and Standards and Guidelines:

a. The following changes are proposed to general direction E03, 06, and 07, section 6(a), (b) and (c) found on page IV–40 of the DNF–LRMP:

''6. The maximum size of openings created by the application of clearcut even-aged silvicultural treatments will be 40 acres regardless of forest cover type. A proposal for larger openings created by the application of clearcut even-aged silvicultural treatment are subject to a 60-day public review and require approval by the Regional Forester as specified in the Regional Guide of 1984. Exceptions to this are:

(a) Larger openings which are the result of natural catastrophic events such as fire, insect or disease attach, and windstorm. These larger openings may be commercially salvaged in blocks larger than 60 acres without requirement for 60-day public review and approval by the Regional Forester. This does not preclude public notification and participation requirements as outlined under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

(b) The area does not meet the definition of a created opening.

b. In addition to this change under the general direction of the DNF–LRMP at page IV–40, the proposed E03, 06, and 07, section 6 (a) and (b) just defined is proposed to be added to each specific Management Area direction, where applicable.

The proposed actions would implement management direction, contribute to meeting the goals and objectives identified in the DNF–LRMP, and move the project area toward the desired condition. This project EIS would be tiered to the Dixie National Forest LRMP EIS (1986), which provides goals, objectives, standards and guidelines for the various activities and land allocations on the Forest.

Based upon the responses to the public scoping effort conducted in April, 1997, the issues that have been identified include: the effects of activities on the undeveloped character of areas within the project area; the effects of the activities on the economic livelihood of local communities (Brian Head Town); the effects of an increase/decrease in access in the area; and, the effects on the Hancock Peak Roadless Area.

Tentative alternatives to the proposed action include: (1) No action (the project would not take place, but current management would continue); (2) no harvest activities associated with road construction within the undeveloped areas and no prescribed fire treatment within the focus area in Center Creek; and, (3) no treatments within the Hancock Peak Roadless Area.

As lead agency, the Forest Service would analyze and document direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects for a range of alternatives. Each alternative would include mitigation measures and monitoring requirements.

Hugh C. Thompson, Forest Supervisor, Dixie National Forest, is the responsible official. He can be reached by mail at 82 North 100 East, P.O. Box 580, Cedar City, Utah, 84720–0580.

The Forest Service is seeking comments from individuals, organizations, and local, state, and Federal agencies who may be interested in or affected by the proposed action. Scoping notices have been sent to potentially affected persons and those currently on the Dixie National Forest mailing list that have expressed interest in timber management proposals, proposals relating to wildlife habitat modifications and Forest Plan amendments. Other interested individuals, organizations, or agencies may have their names added to the mailing list for this project at any time by submitting a request to: Phillip G. Eisenhauer, Project Environmental Coordinator, 82 North 100 East, P.O. Box 627, Cedar City, UT 84720–0627.

The analysis area includes both National Forest System lands and private lands. Proposed treatments would occur only on National Forest system lands. No federal or local permits, licenses or entitlements would be needed.

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 the DEIS must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewers' position and contentions. Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could have been raised at the DEIS 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, (9th Circuit, 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 the time 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 about 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 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.

Dated: June 13, 1997.

Hugh C. Thompson,

Forest Supervisor, Dixie National Forest.

[FR Doc. 97–16260 Filed 6–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

I–90 Land Exchange, Wenatchee National Forest, Kittitas County, WA; Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, King and Pierce Counties, WA; and Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Cowlitz, Lewis, and Skamania Counties, WA

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Revised notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: On April 28, 1997, a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the I–90 Land Exchange with the Plum Creek Lumber Company, Limited Partnership, was published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 22906). This notice announced the responsible official as Judith E. Levin, Director of Recreation, Lands, and Mineral Resources, Pacific Northwest Region. The responsibility for this Land Exchange EIS and decision has been delegated to the Forest Supervisors of the Wenatchee, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie, and Gifford Pinchot National Forests.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Johnston, Assistant Land Staff Officer, Wenatchee National Forest, 215 Melody Lane, Wenatchee, Washington 98801, phone 509–664–2789.

Dated: June 16, 1997.

Cathrine L. Beaty,

Acting Regional Forester.

[FR Doc. 97–16305 Filed 6–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Delegation of Authority to Regional Director of Recreation, Lands, and Mineral Resource, Pacific Northwest Region, Oregon and Washington

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of delegation of authority.

SUMMARY: The Regional Forester of the Pacific Northwest Region of the Forest Service has delegated authority to the Regional Director of Recreation, Lands, and Mineral Resources to issue all easements under authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of October 21, 1976, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1761). The delegation is being issued in a Regional Supplement to the Forest Service Manual 2700, Special Use Management, Section 2704, Responsibility.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 20, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions about the exercise of this delegation may be addressed to Jim Galaba, Special Uses Manager, Pacific Northwest Region, USDA, Forest Service, 333 S.W. First Street, Portland, Oregon 97208, phone 503–808–2458.

Dated: June 16, 1997.

Cathrine L. Beaty,

Acting Regional Forester.

[FR Doc. 97–16306 Filed 6–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Natural Resources Conservation Service

Notice of Proposed Change to Section IV of the Field Office Technical Guide (FOTG) of the Natural Resources Conservation Service in Alabama

AGENCY: Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) in Alabama, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

ACTION: Notice of availability of proposed changes in Section IV of the FOTG of the NRCS in Alabama for review and comment.

SUMMARY: It is the intention of NRC in Alabama to issue conservation practice standard, Well Decommissioning (Code 351) Section IV of the FOTG.

DATES: Comments will be received on or before July 23, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Inquire in writing to Ronnie D. Murphy, State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), 3381