include change in: the type of diesel engines used, the type of pipe used to transport materials and the depth buried, the use of seepage collection features, the design intensity for storm diversions and ponds, the busing of employees, the closing of roads and additional monitoring.

The public will be informed of the availability of the SDEIS by a notice of availability in the **Federal Register**, news releases and mailings of those on the mailing list. The anticipated date of release of the SDEIS for comment is Fall, 1997.

**DATES:** Specific comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be submitted by September 15, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** The responsible official is Robert Schrenk, Forest Supervisor, Kootenai National Forest. Written comments and suggestions concerning the re-analysis and the proposed SDEIS should be sent to the responsible official at 506 U.S. Highway 2 West, Libby, MT 59923.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** Paul Kaiser, Project Coordinator, Kootenai National Forest. Phone: (406) 293–6211.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A new alternative (V) was developed to address the new information received and concerns raised since release of the DEIS on October 6, 1995.

### Original Proposed Action

ASARCO's proposal, which was submitted in 1987, includes constructing a 10,000 ton per day mine and mill complex to develop their stratiform copper/silver ore deposit which is located under the Cabinet Mountains Wilderness. The ore would be accessed via tunnels starting outside and downslope from the wilderness boundary. ASARCO estimates an ore reserve of 136 million tons and mine recovery rate of 65 percent. ASARCO projects the estimated mine life (from beginning through reclamation) to be 32 years. The mine is estimated to employ 305–355 people. Parts of the project would be on National Forest System land with the remainder on private land. Facilities would include a tailings impoundment approximately 250′ high and 324 acres in size, a new access road, utility corridor, water lines, wells, mill site, water treatment site, and rail loadout facility. An exploration adit is proposed to further define the ore body. Two parallel adits (horizontal access passages) would be drilled, one would be used for the ore conveyor and the other for mine access. Two ventilation adits are proposed, one to have its surface opening within the wilderness and the other would use the proposed exploration adit outside the wilderness. Excess mine water is proposed to be discharged to the Clark Fork River after being treated to State water quality standards.

### New Alternative

The new alternative (Alt. V) proposal includes activities on approximately 483 acres. Alternative V has been developed which includes the surface deposition of tailings as a paste, and a water treatment system using a semi-passive bioreact0r and a reverse osmosis process. The concentrate from the mill would be pumped to an enclosed rail loadout facility. There are also changes in mitigations for the project which include change in: the type of diesel engines used, the type of pipe used to transport materials and the depth buried, the use of seepage collection features, the design intensity for storm diversions and ponds, the busing of employees, the closing of roads and additional monitoring.

### Reviewer Obligations

The Forest Service believes it is important to give reviewers notice at this early stage because 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. *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. *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 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 supplement to 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 supplemental statement.

Comments may also address the adequacy of the supplemental to 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.).

Dated: July 31, 1997.

**Robert L. Schrenk,**

*Forest Supervisor, Kootenai National Forest.*

[FR Doc. 97–20897 Filed 8–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## Forest Service

## Cholmondeley Environmental Impact Statement

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to provide timber for the Ketchikan Area timber sale program. The Record of Decision will disclose how the Forest Service has decided to provide harvest units, roads, and associated timber harvesting facilities. The proposed action is to harvest up to an estimated 37 million board feet (mmbf) of timber on an estimated 1,700 acres. A range of alternatives will be developed and will include a no-action alternative. The proposed timber harvest is located within Tongass Forest Plan Management Areas K18 and K19, Value Comparison Units 614, 615, 616, 617, 674, 675 and 676 on Prince of Wales Island, Alaska, on the Craig Ranger District of the Ketchikan Area of the Tongass National Forest.

**DATES:** Comments concerning the scope of this project should be received by September 30, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Please send written comments to Forest Supervisor's Office; Tongass National Forest, Ketchikan Area; Attn: Cholmondeley EIS; Federal Building, Ketchikan, AK 99901.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Questions about the proposal and EIS should be directed to Dale Kanen, District Ranger, Craig Ranger District, Tongass National Forest, P.O. Box 500, Craig, AK 99921 telephone (907) 826–3271 or Norm Matson, Planning Biologist, Federal Building, Ketchikan, AK 99901 telephone (907) 228–6273.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Public participation will be an integral component of the study process and will be especially important at several points during the analysis. The first is during the scoping process. The Forest Service will be seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, local agencies, individuals and organizations that may be interested in, or affected by, the proposed activities. The scoping process will include: (1) Identification of potential issues; (2) identification of issues to be analyzed in depth; and (3) elimination of insignificant issues or those which have been covered by a previous environmental review. Written scoping comments are being solicited through a scoping package that will be sent to the project mailing list. For the Forest Service to best use the scoping input, comments should be received by September 30, 1997. Tentative issues identified for analysis in the EIS include the potential effects of the project on and the relationship of the project to: Subsistence resources, old-growth ecosystem management and the maintenance of habitat for viable populations of wildlife and plant species, timber supply, scenery and recreational resources, anadromous and resident fish habitat, soil and water resources, wetlands, cultural resources and others.

Based on results of scoping and the resource capabilities within the project area, alternatives including a ''no action'' alternative will be developed for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS). The Draft EIS is projected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in April 1998. Subsistence hearings, as provided for in Title VIII, Section 810 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), are planned during the comment period on the Draft EIS. The Final EIS is anticipated by April 1999.

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.* v. *NRDC,* 435 U.S. 519, 553, (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft environmental impact statement stage 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 them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns of the proposed action, comments during scoping and 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.

Comments received in response to this solicitation, including names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposed action and will be available for public inspection. Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered; however, those who submit anonymous comments will not have standing to appeal the subsequent decision under 36 CFR Parts 215 or 217. Additionally, pursuant to 7 CFR 1.27(d), any person may request the agency to withhold a submission from the public record by showing how the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) permits such confidentiality. Requesters should be aware that, under FOIA, confidentiality may be granted in only very limited circumstances, such as to protect trade secrets. The Forest Service will inform the requester of the agency's decision regarding the request for confidentiality, and where the request is denied, the agency will return the submission and notify the requester that the comments may be resubmitted with or without name and address within 7 days.

Permits: Permits required for implementation include the following:

1. U.S. Army Corp of Engineers

—Approval of discharge of dredged or fill material into the waters of the United States under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act;
—Approval of the construction of structures or work in navigable waters of the United States under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899;

2. Environmental Protection Agency

—National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (402) Permit;
—Review Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan;

3. State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources

—Tideland Permit and Lease or Easement;

4. State of Alaska, Department of Environmental Conservation

—Solid Waste Disposal Permit;
—Certification of Compliance with Alaska Water Quality Standards (401 Certification)

*Responsible Official:* Bradley E. Powell, Forest Supervisor, Ketchikan Area, Tongass National Forest, Federal Building, Ketchikan, Alaska 99901, is the responsible official. The responsible official will consider the comments, response, disclosure of environmental consequences, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making the decision and stating the rationale in the Record of Decision.

Dated: July 25, 1997.

**Bradley E. Powell,**

*Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 97–21657 Filed 8–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

---

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

### Eastern Washington Cascades Provincial Advisory Committee

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of field tour.

**SUMMARY:** The Eastern Washington Cascades Provincial Advisory Committee will meet on September 24, 1997, at the Wenatchee National Forest Supervisors Office, 215 Melody Lane, Wenatchee, Washington. The Provincial Advisory Committee members will meet at the Supervisors Office at 9:00 a.m., then proceed to the field tour in the Leavenworth Ranger District (Beehive and Mission Creek areas). The tour will end at 4:00 p.m. This field tour will focus on dry forest management projects. All Eastern Washington