

Center, 500 1st Avenue, Portola, California;

September 28, 2005, there will be two sessions, 1–3 pm and 6:30–9 pm, at the Radisson Hotel, 500 Leisure Lane, Sacramento, California.

Permits or Licenses Required

Approval from the following Agencies is required: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; U.S. Forest Service; Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board; California Department of Water Resources; California Department of Health Services; Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District; California Department of Pesticide Regulation; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Environmental Protection Agency.

Comment Requested

This notice of intent initiates the scoping process which guides the development of the EIS. Comments submitted during the scoping process should be in writing or e-mail, and should be specific to the proposed action. The comments should describe as clearly and completely as possible any point of dispute, debate or disagreement the commentator has with the proposed action. Once scoping letters are received, all potential issues will be identified to analyze in depth, and a reasonable range of alternatives will be developed to address those significant issues. Potential environmental effects of the proposed action as well as alternatives will be analyzed in the EIS.

Early Notice of Importance of Public Participation in Subsequent Environmental Review: A draft environmental impact statement (as part of a joint EIR/EIS) will be prepared for comment. The comment period on the draft EIS 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). 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. *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 for the draft EIS 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 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, including the names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposal and will be available for public inspection.

(Authority: 40 CFR 1501.7 and 1508.22; Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, Section 21).

Dated: September 7, 2005.

Angela L. Dillingham,

District Ranger.

[FR Doc. 05–18204 Filed 9–13–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Ketchikan Resource Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Ketchikan Resource Advisory Committee will meet in Ketchikan, Alaska, October 13, 2005 and December 15, 2005. The purpose of these meetings is to discuss potential projects under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

DATES: The meetings will be held October 12, 2005 and December 15, 2005 at 6 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meetings will be held at the Southeast Alaska Discovery Center Learning Center (back entrance), 50 Main Street, Ketchikan, Alaska. Send written comments to Ketchikan Resource Advisory Committee, c/o District Ranger, USDA Forest Service, 3031 Tongass Ave., Ketchikan, AK 99901, or electronically to ikolund@fs.fed.us.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lynn Kolund, District Ranger, Ketchikan-Misty Fjords Ranger District, Tongass National Forest, (907) 228–4100.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meetings are open to the public. Committee discussion is limited to Forest Service staff and Committee members. However, public input opportunity will be provided and individuals will have the opportunity to address the Committee at that time.

Dated: September 6, 2005.

Forrest Cole,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 05–18207 Filed 9–13–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

DOC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Agency: U.S. Census Bureau.

Title: 2006 Person Interview and Person Interview Reinterview Operations.

Form Number(s): None (automated instrument).

Agency Approval Number: None.

Type of Request: New collection.

Burden: 2,017 hours.

Number of Respondents: 6,050.

Average Hours Per Response: 20 minutes.

Needs and Uses: The U.S. Census Bureau requests authorization from the Office of Management and Budget to conduct a Census Coverage Measurement (CCM) Operation in preparation for the 2010 Census. The CCM operation is to occur during the 2006 Census Test to evaluate new approaches that would produce improved measures of coverage error components for persons enumerated while making reductions in the number of people duplicated.