

zones, timber stand patch size and arrangement in relation to wildlife use, slopes suitable for tractor logging, level and type of recreation use, forest cover type and vegetative structure stage. The existing condition based on the calculated vegetative structure stage (VSS) by site was compared to a possible desired future condition from the Trout Slope Landscape Assessment.

Strips of (mostly dead) trees left between some of the previously harvested areas are too narrow to function as forest cover habitat for certain wildlife species. In many of these same stands the amount of dead trees is so great that the current stand structure stage will not continue to exist much longer. Overstory removal of the dead and diseased trees in these strips would create a mosaic of larger stands of seedling to sapling sized trees. These stands as they grow would, in the long term, provide interior forest habitat for certain wildlife species.

In other locations where past harvest hasn't occurred, only dead trees would be removed, leaving a less dense but more green appearing forest and lower fuel loads.

Maintenance of the remaining live green stands, especially those with a mature component, is needed to provide forest cover in a landscape primarily consisting of seedling/sapling stands and dead trees until young stands grow to function as live mature forest. In selected live stands, removal of individual live and dead trees is expected to improve stand vigor and longevity.

Two other action alternatives have been developed thus far based on resource issues (documented in the previously mentioned EA), in response to public comment on the EA and in consideration of the pending development of a new Forest Service roads policy. These alternatives defer some harvest activity and drop some treatment areas included in the proposed action. One of these alternatives emphasizes harvest from the existing road system only, using longer skidding distances and alternate skidding patterns to access treatment areas.

#### Public Involvement

Comments received and issues which were raised during the development of the Trout Slope East EA will be carried forward and considered in this EIS. Additional comments are encouraged. Public participation is especially important at several points during the analysis, particularly during initial scoping and review of the draft EIS. Individuals, organizations, federal, state,

and local agencies who are interested in or affected by the decision are invited to participate in the scoping process. This information will be used in the preparation of the draft EIS.

Formal scoping begins upon publication of this notice and will include mailing of information to known interested parties.

The second major opportunity for public input is the draft EIS. The draft EIS is expected to be filed with the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) and to be available for public review in April of 1999. At that time the EPA will publish a notice of availability of the draft EIS in the **Federal Register**. The comment period on the draft EIS 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 this proposed action participate at that time. To be the most helpful, comments on the draft EIS should be as specific as possible and may address the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed (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).

The Forest Service believes it is important to give reviewers notice at this early stage of several federal court decisions 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, 533 (1978). Second, environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. *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 a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final EIS.

After the comment period ends on the draft EIS, the comments will be analyzed and considered by the Forest Service in preparing the final EIS.

Dated: February 1, 1999.

**Bert Kulesza,**

*Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 99-3322 Filed 2-11-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Proposed Middle Little Salmon Watershed Projects, Payette National Forest, Idaho

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the proposed Middle Little Salmon Watershed Projects, New Meadows Ranger District, Payette National Forest, Idaho. The proposed action would harvest timber, obliterate roads to reduce sediment, close other roads to reduce wildlife vulnerability, control noxious weeds, and adjust a Forest Service-private land boundary fence. A range of alternatives, including the no action alternative, will be developed as appropriate to address issues.

The agency invites comments and suggestions on the scope of the analysis to be included in the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS). In addition, the agency gives notice of the full environmental analysis and decision making process that is beginning on the proposal so that interested and affected people know how they may participate and contribute to the final decision.

**DATES:** Comments on the scope of the analysis must be received by February 13, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit written comments and suggestions concerning the scope of the analysis to Doug Havlina, Middle Little Salmon, Watershed Projects Team Leader, New Meadows Ranger District, Payette National Forest, PO Box J, New Meadows, Idaho 83654.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Questions about the proposed action should be directed to Doug Havlina, phone (208) 347-0300.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Payette National Forest Plan (1988) provides forest-wide direction for management of the resources of the Payette National Forest, including timber. The environmental impact statement for the Forest Plan (1988) analyzed a range of alternatives for management of the Middle Little Salmon and Mud Creek watersheds. The

Plan allocated this area to general forest, including timber management and assigned it to Management Area #11. The area has had previous entries for timber harvest.

As well as forest-wide direction, the plan gives specific direction for this management area. It requires integrated protection of multiple resources including fish, wildlife, range, soil and water, timber, and fire/fuels.

Public participation will be especially important at several points during the analysis, particularly during scoping of issues and review of the DEIS. The first opportunity in the process is scoping.

The scoping process includes:

1. Identifying potential issues.
2. Identifying issues to be analyzed in detail.
3. Eliminating insignificant issues or those covered by a relevant previous environmental analysis.
4. Determining potential cooperating agencies and responsibilities.

The Forest Service will consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, on potential impacts on threatened and endangered species.

Preliminary issues include effects on fisheries, wildlife, recreation, water quality, and economics.

The second major opportunity for public input is with the DEIS. The DEIS will analyze a range of alternatives to the proposed action, including the no-action alternative. The DEIS is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review in July, 1999. EPA will then publish a notice of availability of the DEIS in the **Federal Register**. Public comments are invited at that time.

The comment period on the DEIS will be 45 days from the date the EPA 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 DEIS's must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts the agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC, 435 U.S. 519, 533 (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 the 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 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.

In the FEIS the Forest Service is required to respond to comments received (40 CFR 1503.4). The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, environmental consequences discussed in the FEIS, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making the final decision regarding this proposal. The responsible official will document the decision and reasons for it in the Record of Decision. That decision will be subject to appeal under 36 CFR 215.

David F. Alexander, Forest Supervisor of the Payette National Forest, McCall, Idaho, is the responsible official for this EIS.

Dated: February 4, 1999.

**David F. Alexander,**  
*Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 99-3450 Filed 2-11-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Eastern Washington Cascades Provincial Advisory Committee and Yakima Provincial Advisory Committee

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Eastern Washington Cascades Provincial Advisory Committee and Yakima Provincial Advisory Committee will meet on Friday, February 26, 1999, at the Wenatchee National Forest headquarters

conference room, 215 Melody Lane, Wenatchee, Washington. The meeting will begin at 9:00 a.m. and continue until 3:30 p.m. The first part of the meeting will be devoted to subcommittee proposals for a Methow Valley dry forest management proposal, and the remainder of the day will be dedicated to presentations on listing of fish species under the Endangered Species Act. All Eastern Washington Cascades and Yakima Provincial Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public. Interested citizens are welcome to attend.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Direct questions regarding this meeting to Paul Hart, Designated Federal Official, USDA, Wenatchee National Forest, 215 Melody Lane, Wenatchee, Washington 98801, 509-662-4335.

Dated: February 3, 1999.

**Sonny J. O'Neal,**

*Forest Supervisor, Wenatchee National Forest.*

[FR Doc. 99-3503 Filed 2-11-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

### Procurement List; Proposed Additions and Deletion

**AGENCY:** Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

**ACTION:** Proposed additions to and deletion from Procurement List.

**SUMMARY:** The Committee has received proposals to add to the Procurement List services to be furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities, and to delete a service previously furnished by such agencies.

**COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED ON OR BEFORE:** March 15, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, Crystal Gateway 3, Suite 310, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202-4302.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Beverly Milkman (703) 603-7740.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This notice is published pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 47(a)(2) and 41 CFR 51-2.3. Its purpose is to provide interested persons an opportunity to submit comments on the possible impact of the proposed actions.