

office (See **ADDRESSES**). The remaining documents will be available in the docket clerks office as soon as they are published.

1. Report by the Secretariat on Matters Referred by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and/or Other Codex Committees to the Food Hygiene Committee including the Report of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Risk Assessment of Microbiological Hazards in Foods (CX/FH 99/2).

2. Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Bottled/Packed Drinking Waters (Other than Natural Mineral Waters), (CL 1999/9-FH). Government Comments—(CX/FH 99/3).

3. \*Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for the Transport of Foodstuffs in Bulk and Semi-Packed Foodstuffs (CX/FH 99/4). Government Comments—(CX/FH 99/4-Add. 1).

4. \*Proposed Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Milk and Milk Products (CX/FH 99/5). Government Comments—(CX/FH 99/5-Add. 1).

5. \*Proposed Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for the Primary Production, Harvesting and Packaging of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CX/FH 99/6). Government Comments—(CX/FH 99/6-Add. 1).

6. \*Proposed Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Pre-Cut Fruits and Vegetables at Step 4 (CX/FH 99/7). Government Comments—(CX/FH 99/7-Add. 1).

7. \*Proposed Draft Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management (CX/FH 99/8). Government Comments—(CX/FH 99/8-Add. 1).

8. Discussion Paper on HACCP in Less Developed Businesses (CX/FH 99/9).

9. \*Discussion Paper on Proposed Draft Recommendations for the Control of Listeria monocytogenes in Foods in International Trade (CX/FH 99/10).

10. Discussion Paper on Viruses in Foods (CX/FH 99/11).

11. Discussion Paper on Antibiotic Resistance in Food (CX/FH 99/12).

12. Discussion Paper on Proposed Draft Guidelines for the Hygienic Reuse of Processing Water in Food Plants (CX/FH 99/13).

13. \*Priorities for the Revision of Codes of Hygienic Practice (CX/FH 99/14).

#### Additional Public Notification

Pursuant to Department Regulation 4300-4, "Civil Rights Impact Analysis," dated September 22, 1993, FSIS has considered the potential civil rights impact of this public meeting on minorities, women, and persons with disabilities. FSIS anticipates that this public meeting will not have a negative or disproportionate impact on minorities, women, or persons with disabilities. However, public meetings generally are designed to provide information and receive public comments on substantive issues which may lead to new or revised agency regulations or instructions. Public involvement in all segments of rulemaking and policy development are

important. Consequently, in an effort to better ensure that minorities, women, and persons with disabilities are made aware of this public meeting and are informed about the mechanism for providing their comments, FSIS will announce it and provide copies of this **Federal Register** publication in the FSIS Constituent Update.

FSIS provides a weekly FSIS Constituent Update, which is communicated via fax to over 300 organizations and individuals. In addition, the update is available on line through the FSIS web page located at <http://www.fsis.usda.gov>. The update is used to provide information regarding FSIS policies, procedures, regulations, **Federal Register** Notices, FSIS public meetings, recalls, and any other types of information that could affect or would be of interest to our constituents/stakeholders. The constituent fax list consists of industry, trade, and farm groups, consumer interest groups, allied health professionals, scientific professionals and other individuals that have requested to be included. Through these various channels, FSIS is able to provide information with a much broader, more diverse audience. For more information and to be added to the constituent fax list, fax your request to the Office of Congressional and Public Affairs, at (202) 720-5704.

Done at Washington, DC, on October 1, 1999.

**F. Edward Scarbrough,**

*U.S. Manager for Codex Alimentarius.*

[FR Doc. 99-26124 Filed 10-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-DM-P

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan for the Medicine Bow National Forest, Albany County, Carbon County, Converse County, Natrona County, Platte County, WY

**AGENCY:** USDA Forest Service.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement in conjunction with revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan for the Medicine Bow National Forest.

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement in conjunction with the revision of its Land and Resource Management Plan (hereafter referred to as Forest Plan or Plan) for the Medicine Bow National Forest. This notice describes the proposed action, specific portions of the current Forest plan to be revised, environmental issues

considered in the revision, estimated dates for filing the environmental impact statement, information concerning public participation, and the names and addresses of the agency officials who can provide additional information.

**DATES:** The public is asked to provide comments identifying and considering issues, concerns, and the scope of analysis with regard to the proposed action, in writing by November 15, 1999. The Forest Service expects to file a Draft Environmental Impact Statement with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and make it available for public comment in October of 2000. The Forest Service expects to file a Final Environmental Impact Statement in December of 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to: Jerry E. Schmidt, Forest Supervisor, Medicine Bow-Routt National Forest, 2468 Jackson Street, Laramie, Wyoming 82070.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT:** Dee Hines, Forest Planner, (307) 745-2473.

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:** Rocky Mountain Regional Forester at P.O. Box 25127, Lakewood, CO 80225-0127.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to part 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 219.10(g), the Regional Forester for the Rocky Mountain Region gives notice of the agency's intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for the revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan (hereafter referred to as Forest Plan or Plan—for the Medicine Bow National Forest. According to 36 CFR 219.10(g), land and resource management plans are ordinarily revised on a 10 to 15 year cycle. The existing Forest Plan was approved on November 20, 1985.

The Forest Service is the lead agency in this revision effort. The state of Wyoming, by and through the Office of Federal Land Policy, is a Cooperating Agency (40 CFR 1501.6) by virtue of special expertise. The Rocky Mountain Regional Forester is the Deciding Officer and Responsible Official.

Forest plans describe the intended management of National Forests. Agency decisions in these plans do the following:

1. Establish multiple-use goals and objectives (36 CFR 219.11 (b)).
2. Establish forestwide management standards and guidelines applying to future activities (resource integration requirements, 36 CFR 219.13 to 219.27).
3. Establish management areas and management area direction (management area prescriptions)

applying to future activities in that management area (resource integration and minimum specific management requirements) 36 CFR 219.11(c).

4. Establish monitoring and evaluation requirements (36 CFR 219.11(d)).

5. Determine suitability and potential capability of lands for resource production. This includes designation of suitable timber land and establishment of allowable timber sale quantity (36 CFR 219.14 through 219.26).

6. Where applicable, recommend designations of special areas such as Wilderness (36 CFR 219.17) and Wild and Scenic Rivers (The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act) to Congress.

### Need for Change in the Current Forest Plan

The existing Forest Plan was approved in 1985. In addition to the regulatory requirement to revise Forest Plans every 10 to 15 years, our experience in implementing the plan and monitoring the effects of that implementation indicates that we need to make some changes in management direction. Several other sources have also highlighted the need for changes in the current Forest Plan. These sources include the following:

- Public involvement which has identified new information and public values.
- Monitoring and scientific research which have identified new information and knowledge gained.
- Forest plan implementation which has identified management concerns to find better ways for accomplishing desired conditions.

Many concerns about management direction in the current plan result from a lack of integration of the various resources areas in the plan. An ecosystems-based approach to strategic planning, also called ecosystem management, offers an opportunity to address and achieve this needed integration. Ecosystem management is the management of natural resources to maintain or restore the sustainability of ecosystems, thereby providing multiple benefits to present and future generations. It recognizes the biological, physical, and human dimension of ecosystems.

Since the Medicine Bow Plan was approved in 1985, the Forest Service has adopted a new agenda. This new approach, A National Resource Agenda for the 21st Century, will be the foundation for national forest management into the 21st century. There are four key areas in the new agenda:

1. Watershed health and restoration.
2. Sustainable forest ecosystem management.
3. Forest roads.
4. Recreation.

Other developments include the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) which was passed in 1993. This act directs the preparation of periodic strategic plans by federal agencies. The first strategic plan for the Forest Service was written in 1997 and centers around the following three goals:

1. Ensure sustainable ecosystems.
  2. Provide multiple benefits for people within the capabilities of ecosystems.
  3. Ensure organizational effectiveness.
- Ecosystem management, the Natural Resource Agenda for the 21st Century, and the GPRA Strategic Plan each concentrate and focus on outcomes and desired resource conditions, the results of management. These changes need to be incorporated into the Forest Plan.

### Preparing the Plan and EIS

An interdisciplinary team is conducting the environmental analysis and preparing an environmental impact statement associated with revision of the Forest Plan. This interdisciplinary team will also prepare the revised Forest Plan. As part of this effort, the interdisciplinary team has already developed a list of forestwide standards and guidelines; identified 32 management areas; and developed the corresponding management area themes, settings, desired condition statements, and management area-specific standards and guidelines. These will be used to develop alternatives to the proposed action for the revised Forest Plan. This material is available at the Medicine Bow National Forest headquarters.

### Proposed Action

The revised Land and Resource Management Plan for the Medicine Bow National Forest will be built on principles of ecosystem management. This integrated approach will address many of the questions about and concerns with the 1985 Plan. The revised Forest Plan and associated analysis will also respond to the four points in the new Forest Service agenda, a National Resource Agenda for the 21st Century. In addition, the goals of the GPRA Strategic Plan will be featured in the revised plan. Accordingly, the revised Forest Plan will concentrate on desired conditions of the resource and the outcomes of management actions.

The Revised Forest Plan will include a monitoring strategy to measure how

effectively the Plan meets stated goals and objectives. In keeping with the Natural Resource Agenda, this strategy will focus on outcomes and desired resource conditions rather than outputs.

### Major Revision Topics

We identified the following six revision topics through annual Forest Plan monitoring reports, review of regulations, internal Forest Service discussions, and discussions with the public through a series of open houses in communities adjacent to the National Forest:

- Biological Diversity.
- Timber Suitability and Management of Forested Lands.
- Recreation Opportunities.
- Roadless Area Allocation and Management.
- Wild and Scenic Rivers.
- Oil and Gas Leasing.

The following sections discuss the current management direction, the need for change, and a proposed action for each of the revision topics.

### Biological Diversity

#### Current Direction

Direction in the current Plan is intended to produce a diversity of habitats well-distributed throughout the landscape. This approach to managing biological diversity produces a very heterogeneous landscape at a fine scale. Patches are small, with a high percentage of edge habitat. Patches are areas where the vegetation is similar in species, age, and size. Natural disturbance processes are generally controlled or suppressed. All habitats, including late successional forests are well-distributed but generally in small patches. The current plan contains one Research Natural Area and 6 Special Interest Areas which feature biological diversity-related features.

#### Need for Change

Public interest in biological diversity and how best to maintain it has grown substantially since the current Forest Plan was approved in 1985. Biological diversity or various aspects of it (such as threatened, endangered, and sensitive species management or forest health) have been issues in environmental analyses in recent years. The current plan's emphasis on heterogeneous habitats and exclusion of natural disturbance events has caused concerns about sustainability of the forested ecosystems.

Direction in the current plan does not fully reflect the latest scientific information on land management planning. This new information needs

to be incorporated into the revised plan, particularly the principles of ecosystem management, with attention given to managing the system as a whole.

#### Proposed Action

The proposed action is to increase the acreage where natural disturbance events (fire, insects and disease) are tolerated, increase the size of patches on the landscape, and provide increased acreage and larger blocks in late successional habitats. These goals would be accomplished through several methods, including the following:

- Allocating inventoried roadless areas to prescriptions with an emphasis on late successional forests and natural disturbance processes.
- Extending rotation ages and emulating natural landscape patch size in many areas where timber harvest is allowed.

The use of fire as a management tool would also be increased, especially in ecosystems with a short or moderate fire return interval. In addition, the proposed action includes 5, and potentially 6 additional Research Natural Areas (the current plan has 1). The current plan has 6 Special Interest Areas (SIAs); the proposed action adds 11. There would be changes to two of the current SIAs. One would be renamed and would increase in size; one would become an RNA. Many of the resulting 16 proposed SIA's would also feature biological diversity goals.

#### *Timber Suitability and Management of Forested Lands*

##### Current Direction

The current Forest Plan allocates approximately two-thirds of the tentatively suited lands in 7 management area prescriptions to timber management. Timber management is practiced across these 7 management areas, with differing management emphases and intentions.

##### Need for Change

The following indicate a need for change in the management of forested lands:

- Projected harvest levels in the current plan are not being achieved.
- There is concern over what constitutes sustainable harvest levels.
- Reevaluation of the tentatively suited lands is required at 10 years (36 CFR 219.12(k)(5)(ii)).
- Allocation of existing roadless areas to timber management prescriptions continues to be very controversial.
- Silvicultural prescriptions specified in various management areas are in conflict with other multiple use management activities in those areas.

- Current forest conditions indicate treatments for products other than sawlogs are needed.

##### Proposed Action

Under the proposed action, timber harvest would continue in areas with an existing network of roads and past timber management activities. Timber management would not take place in areas where trees were not harvested in the past. Forest management actions would stress sustainable forest ecosystems and healthy watersheds. Timber stands would be managed as vigorous green forests. These forest health goals would be achieved through a variety of even- and uneven-aged silvicultural practices, including an emphasis on products other than sawlogs. Management intensity would vary across those lands allocated to timber production through a mix of silvicultural prescriptions and rotation ages.

#### *Recreation Opportunities*

##### Current Direction

The current plan emphasizes roaded natural recreation opportunities which are accommodated by an extensive road system. Following project implementation, many roads have been closed but not obliterated to allow their use in future management activities. These road closures, combined with the Forest's off-road policy, have facilitated a new road system created by users.

Under the current plan, there was an increase in semi-primitive ROS class opportunities. A key concern is the sporadic distribution of these opportunities which precludes true semi-primitive experiences.

##### Need for Change

Recreation opportunities have not kept pace with increasingly diverse demands, and these demands are expected to increase as the population increases. Recreation-related controversy (*i.e.*, conflicts between recreationists and management activities, conflicts between recreation users) have increased over the last 15 years. In many cases, management actions in the current Forest Plan are in conflict with the recreation objectives for a given management area.

Motorized use has changed since the current plan was signed. In particular, there is more off-highway vehicle use on the Forest, creating a need to re-evaluate current travel management policies. Rather than imposing blanket restrictions, motorized uses and their distribution need to be addressed through management area allocations.

##### Proposed Action

Under the proposed action, recreation opportunities would accommodate new and diverse demands. This would be achieved by the following:

- Increasing the amount of semi-primitive ROS classes.
- Connecting semi-primitive areas by way of new and existing roads and trails.
- Increasing and improving dispersed recreation opportunities using existing roads and trails and those developed for other management actions.
- Improving the settings in and around current facilities and providing opportunities and readily available amenities from these sites.

The proposed action would maintain current dispersed recreation opportunities, and include consideration for these opportunities in future management activities. It would also include specific management area allocations for both motorized and nonmotorized activities. In addition, the proposed action would include direction to improve public access.

The proposed action would not include additional developed facilities, rather the focus would be on improvements and bringing current facilities up to standard. Renovation of current facilities would focus on accessibility, improving setting amenities and other recreation opportunities, and providing areas for larger recreational vehicles.

#### *Roadless Area Allocation and Management*

##### Current Direction

The President signed the Wyoming Wilderness Act of 1984 (PL 98-550) which designated three new wilderness areas on the Medicine Bow National Forest, in addition to the existing Savage Run Wilderness (14,930 acres). Areas designated by the 1984 Act include the Platte River Wilderness (22,749 acres), the Encampment River Wilderness (10,124 acres), and the Huston Park Wilderness (30,726 acres). The Act also released all remaining areas (those areas not designated as wilderness by the Act) to multiple-use management. The current plan allocates many of these remaining roadless areas to prescriptions which allow road building.

##### Need for Change

Inventory of roadless areas is a requirement in the revision process (36 CFR 219.17). Management of inventoried roadless areas continues to be controversial. These conflicts are a

result of varying resource demands on the roadless areas.

#### Proposed Action

The proposed action is to complete an inventory of roadless areas, evaluate these areas to determine wilderness potential (36 CFR 219.17), and allocate most of the roadless areas to varying management area prescriptions which retain the roadless character. Exceptions might be made on the Laramie Peak unit where ecosystem health goals may require more active management with limited road building.

#### *Wild and Scenic Rivers*

#### Proposed Action

In the current plan, there is no management area used specifically for Wild and Scenic Rivers. Designation of the North Platte and Encampment Rivers was recommended to Congress. Congress has not acted to officially designate either river, however they remain under the wilderness prescription, and their unique qualities are safeguarded by the wilderness standards and guidelines.

#### Need for Change

The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, as amended (December 31, 1992) and Forest Service Handbook 1909.12, Chapter 8, direct the Forest Service to evaluate rivers for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System during forest planning. Proposed designation of two eligible rivers, the North Platte and the Encampment, has not been acted on by Congress. These two rivers, as well as other rivers on the forest, need to be evaluated to determine their eligibility for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic River System.

#### Proposed Action

The proposed action is to allocate all eligible rivers to wild and scenic river prescriptions accordingly. Two rivers, the North Platte and the Encampment, qualified for inclusion in the wild and scenic rivers program and would be protected under wild and scenic management prescriptions until a suitability determination is made. Both rivers have stretches that would qualify under the wild river prescription as well as scenic river prescription. Suitability determinations would be made with future site-specific analysis when the need arises.

#### *Oil and Gas Leasing*

#### Current Direction

In the current plan, most of the analysis area is available for leasing, but no lands are authorized for leasing.

Current Forest Plan standards and guidelines are followed, and leases would be issued on a lease by lease basis.

#### Need for Change

In 1987, Congress passed the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act (Leasing Reform Act). The Leasing Reform Act requires analysis that was not conducted for the 1985 Forest Plan.

#### Proposed Action

The proposed action is to make most land available for leasing with specified stipulations. Stipulations would vary according to resource needs and the desired conditions of associated management areas.

#### Involving the Public

The Regional Forester gives notice that the Forest is beginning an environmental analysis and decision making process for this proposed action. We encourage any interested or affected people to participate in the analysis and contribute to the final decision.

We will provide opportunities for open public discussion of the proposed action including changes to the revision topics. We encourage the public to comment on this specific proposal. Focusing on the proposal will generate specific scoping comments on the revision topics and decisions to be made, and make the revision process more effective. The Analysis of the Management Situation contains baseline information, including the 32 management areas and the No Action Alternative, to help evaluate how the proposed action and the alternatives address the revision topics and the six decisions (listed previously) made in forest plan revisions. This information will be available in late 1999.

We will develop a broad range of alternatives (including the No Action Alternative) to the proposed action based on the comment received and on further analysis. Accordingly, we expect the alternative considered and the final decision to vary from what is put forth in the proposed action.

Public participation is invited throughout the revision process and will be especially important at several points during the process. We will make information available through periodic newsletters, news releases, the Internet (<http://www.fs.fed.us/mrnf/rev/medrev/medrev.htm>), and various public meetings. The first public meetings will be held after the Analysis of the Management Situation is completed in late 1999. Meeting dates will be well published through the media mentioned above.

#### Cooperative Agencies

The state of Wyoming, by and through the Office of Federal Land Policy, is a Cooperating Agency (40 CFR 1501.6) by virtue of special expertise in the areas of social assessment, public participation, and wildlife management.

#### Release and Review of the EIS

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public comment in October of 2000. At that time, the EPA will publish a notice of availability for the DEIS in the **Federal Register**. The comment period on the DEIS will be 90 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 the 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 contention; *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 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. 1335, 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 three-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 statements. 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, comments will be analyzed, considered, and responded by the Forest Service in preparing the Final EIS. The FEIS, is scheduled to be completed in December of 2001. The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, environmental consequences discussed in the FEIS, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making decisions regarding the revision. The responsible official will document the decisions and reasons for the decisions in a Record of Decision for the revised Plan. The decision will be subject to appeal in accordance with 36 CFR Part 217.

Dated: September 23, 1999.

**Tom L. Thompson,**

*Acting Regional Forester, Rocky Mountain Region.*

[FR Doc. 99-26175 Filed 10-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### **Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Comanche and Cimarron National Grasslands, Headquartered in Pueblo, CO**

**AGENCY:** USDA, Forest Service.

**ACTION:** Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in conjunction with revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan for the Pike and San Isabel National Forests, and the Comanche and Cimarron National Grasslands (PSICC), located in Clear Creek, Douglas, Jefferson, EL Paso, Teller, Park, Summit, Lake, Chafee, Saguache, Fremont, Custer, Heurafano, Costilla, Pueblo, Las Animas, Otero, and Baca counties in Colorado, and Morton and Stevens counties in Kansas.

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Service will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in conjunction with the revision of its Land and Resource Management Plan (hereafter referred to as the Plan) for the Pike and San Isabel National Forests, and the Comanche and Cimarron National Grasslands, (hereafter referred to as PSICC).

This notice describes the proposed action, specific portions of the current Plan to be revised, environmental issues considered in the revision, estimated dates for filing the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), information concerning public participation, and the names and addresses of the agency officials who can provide additional information.

**DATES:** The Public is asked to provide comments identifying and considering issues, concerns, and the scope of the analysis with regard to the proposed action, in writing by January 31, 2000. The Forest Service proposes to file a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and make it available for public comment in the spring of 2001. The Forest Service proposes to file a Final Plan and EIS that will be available in the fall of 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Hill, Planning Staff Officer, (719) 545-8737. Please send written comments on this Notice of Intent to: Donnie R. Sparks, Acting Forest Supervisor, PSICC, 1920 Valley Drive, Pueblo, CO 81008-1797.

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:** Lyle Laverty, Rocky Mountain Regional Forester at P.O. Box 25127, Lakewood, CO 80225-0127.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to Part 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 219.10(g), the Regional Forester for the Rocky Mountain Region gives notice of the agency's intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for the revision effort described above. According to 36 CFR 216.10(g), land and resource management plans are ordinarily revised on a 10 to 15 year cycle. The existing Forest Plan was approved on September, 1984. This Plan has been amended 25 times including two major amendments related to the December 1991 Oil and Gas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the 1993 Colorado Wilderness bill.

The Regional Forester gives notice that the Forest is beginning an environmental analysis and decision-making process for this proposed action so that interested or affected people can participate in the analysis and contribute to the final decision.

Opportunities will be provided to discuss the Forest Plan revision process openly with the public. The public is invited to help identify issues and define the range of alternatives to be considered in the environmental impact statement. Forest Service officials will lead these discussions, helping to describe issues and the preliminary alternatives. These officials will also explain the environmental analysis process and the disclosures of that analysis, which will be available for public review. Written comments identifying issues for analysis and the range of alternatives are encouraged to be submitted to PSICC by January 21, 2000. A regular schedule of public meetings will be in the summer of 2000. Alternative development meetings will

be held in winter of 2000. Public notice of dates, times, and locations for specific meetings will be provided in local newspapers and posted on the Forest's web site: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/psicc>. Additionally, we will send notices and newsletters to those on the forest plan revision mailing list. Requests to be placed on this mailing list should be sent to the comment address stated above.

Two Plans will be written in accordance with National direction from Mike Dombek, Chief of the Forest Service. One will describe the intended management of the Pike and San Isabel National Forests; the other will describe the intended management of the Comanche and Cimarron National Grasslands.

The United States has a unique legal relationship with Indian tribal governments as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, treaties, statutes, Executive orders, and court decisions. As part of the overall effort to uphold the federal trust responsibilities to tribal sovereign nations to the extent applicable to National Forest System lands, the Forest Service will establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with the tribal nations on a government-to-government basis. The Forest Service will work with governments to address issues concerning Indian tribal self-government and sovereignty, natural and cultural resources held in trust, Indian tribal treaty and Executive order rights, and any issues that significantly or uniquely affect their communities.

Forest Plans make six fundamental decisions.<sup>1</sup> These decisions are:

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

2. Establishment of forestwide management requirements (standards and guidelines) to fulfill the requirements of the NFMA relating to future activities (resource integration requirements of 36 CFR 219.13 to 219.27).

3. Establishing of management area direction (management area prescriptions) applying to future management activities in that management area (36 CFR 219.11).

4. Designation of land suitable for timber production and the establishment of allowable timber sale quality (36 CFR 219.14 and 219.16).

5. Nonwilderness multiple-use allocations for those roadless areas that were reviewed under 36 CFR 219.17 and

<sup>1</sup> *Citizens for Environmental Quality v. U.S.* 731 F. Supp. 977 (D.Colo. 1989).