

We are asking the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve our use of these information collection activities for 3 years.

The purpose of this notice is to solicit comments from the public (as well as agencies) concerning our information collection. These comments will help us:

(1) Evaluate whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the information collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the information collection on those who are to respond, through use, as appropriate, of automated, electronic, mechanical, and other collection technologies, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Estimate of burden: The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.8840854 hours per response.

Respondents: Sheep producers in 22 States.

Estimated annual number of respondents: 5,500.

Estimated annual number of responses per respondent: 1.7285454.

Estimated annual number of responses: 9,507.

Estimated total annual burden on respondents: 8,405 hours. (Due to averaging, the total annual burden hours may not equal the product of the annual number of responses multiplied by the reporting burden per response.)

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Done in Washington, DC, this 23rd day of August 2010.

Gregory Parham

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2010-21455 Filed 8-26-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-S

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS-2010-0065]

Notice of Decision To Issue Permits for the Importation of Fresh Mango Fruit From Pakistan Into the Continental United States

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We are advising the public of our decision to begin issuing permits for the importation into the continental United States of fresh mango fruit from Pakistan. Based on the findings of a pest risk analysis, which we made available to the public for review and comment through a previous notice, we believe that the application of one or more designated phytosanitary measures will be sufficient to mitigate the risks of introducing or disseminating plant pests or noxious weeds via the importation of fresh mango fruit from Pakistan.

DATES: *Effective Date:* August 27, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Donna L. West, Senior Import Specialist, Regulatory Coordination and Compliance, PPQ, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 133, Riverdale, MD 20737; (301) 734-0627.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under the regulations in “Subpart—Fruits and Vegetables” (7 CFR 319.56-1 through 319.56-50, referred to below as the regulations), the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture prohibits or restricts the importation of fruits and vegetables into the United States from certain parts of the world to prevent plant pests from being introduced into and spread within the United States.

Section 319.56-4 contains a performance-based process for approving the importation of commodities that, based on the findings of a pest risk analysis, can be safely imported subject to one or more of the designated phytosanitary measures listed in paragraph (b) of that section. Under that process, APHIS publishes a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing the availability of the pest risk analysis that evaluates the risks associated with the importation of a particular fruit or vegetable. Following the close of the 60-day comment period, APHIS may begin issuing permits for importation of the fruit or vegetable

subject to the identified designated measures if: (1) No comments were received on the pest risk analysis; (2) the comments on the pest risk analysis revealed that no changes to the pest risk analysis were necessary; or (3) changes to the pest risk analysis were made in response to public comments, but the changes did not affect the overall conclusions of the analysis and the Administrator’s determination of risk.

In accordance with that process, we published a notice¹ in the **Federal Register** on June 17, 2010 (75 FR 34422, Docket No. APHIS-2010-0065), in which we announced the availability, for review and comment, of a pest risk analysis that evaluates the risks associated with the importation into the continental United States of fresh mango fruit from Pakistan. We solicited comments on the notice for 60 days ending on August 16, 2010. We received 19 comments by that date, from nurseries, exporters, private citizens, a marketing agency, and a State department of agriculture. All of the commenters supported the importation of fresh mango fruit from Pakistan under the conditions described in the risk management document.

Therefore, in accordance with the regulations in § 319.56-4(c)(2)(ii), we are announcing our decision to begin issuing permits for the importation into the continental United States of fresh mango fruit from Pakistan subject to the following phytosanitary measures:

- The mangoes must be irradiated with a minimum absorbed dose of 400 gray.
- If irradiation is applied outside of the United States, each consignment of mangoes must be inspected jointly by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of Pakistan and APHIS inspectors and accompanied by a phytosanitary certificate issued by the NPPO of Pakistan. The phytosanitary certificate must document that the consignment received the required irradiation treatment. The phytosanitary certificate must also contain an additional declaration that states: “This consignment was inspected jointly by APHIS and Government of Pakistan inspectors, and found free of *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *mangiferaeindicae*.” To be consistent with International Plant Protection Convention standards, treatment specifics, including the application of 400 Gy dose, will be located in the treatment section of the phytosanitary

¹ To view the notice, the pest risk analysis, the risk management analysis, and the comments we received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov/fdmspublic/component/main?main=DocketDetail&d=APHIS-2010-0065>.

certificate, rather than in the additional declaration.

If irradiation is to be applied upon arrival in the United States, each consignment of mangoes must be inspected by inspectors from the NPPO of Pakistan prior to departure and accompanied by a phytosanitary certificate issued by the NPPO of Pakistan. The phytosanitary certificate must contain an additional declaration that states: "This consignment was inspected by the Government of Pakistan inspectors and found free of *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *mangiferaeindicae*."

- The mangoes may be imported into the United States in commercial consignments only.

These conditions will be listed in the Fruits and Vegetables Import Requirements Database (available at <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/favir>). In addition to those specific measures, mangoes from Pakistan will be subject to the general requirements listed in § 319.56–3 that are applicable to the importation of all fruits and vegetables.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 450, 7701–7772, and 7781–7786; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

Done in Washington, DC, this 25th day of August 2010.

Gregory Parham,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2010–21568 Filed 8–26–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Nationwide Aerial Application of Fire Retardant on National Forest System Lands

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

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

SUMMARY: The Forest Service will prepare a programmatic environmental impact statement for the continued nationwide aerial application of fire retardant on National Forest System lands. The responsible official for this action is the Chief of the Forest Service. The Forest Service invites comments at this time on the proposed action.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope of the analysis must be received by October 12, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to U.S. Forest Service, P.O. Box 26667, Salt Lake City, UT 84126–0667. Comments may also be sent via e-mail to FireRetardantEIS@fs.fed.us.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joe Carbone, Assistant Director for Ecosystem Management Coordination, Forest Service, 202–205–0884, or e-mail: jcarbone@fs.fed.us.

Individuals who use telecommunication devices for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Forest Service is working to restore fire-adapted ecosystems through prescribed fire, other fuel treatments, and effective management of wildfire to achieve both protection and resource benefit objectives. However, in some circumstances, fire must be suppressed. For example, it might be necessary to suppress a fire to protect life or property or to preserve natural resources and critical habitat for threatened and endangered species. Fire retardant is one of the tools used to suppress fires.

Aerially applied fire retardant reduces the spread and intensity of fires and slows larger, more damaging, and thus, more costly fires. In many situations, using retardant to fight fires is the most effective and efficient method of protecting people, resources, private property, and facilities; sometimes it is the only tool that will allow fire fighters to accomplish the job in a safe manner.

In October 2007, the Forest Service issued an environmental assessment (EA) and decision notice and finding of no significant impact (DN/FONSI) entitled "Aerial Application of Fire Retardant". In February 2008, the Forest Service amended the DN/FONSI by incorporating the reasonable and prudent alternatives proposed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries during the Section 7 consultation process prescribed by the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

On July 27, 2010, the United States District Court for the District of Montana issued a decision in *Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics v. United States Forest Service*, 08–43 (D. Mont.) that invalidated the Forest Service's decision to adopt the 2000 Guidelines based on violations of NEPA. The Court also held that the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries' Section 7 consultation with the Forest Service violated the ESA. The Court directed the Forest Service, USFWS, and NOAA Fisheries to cure these NEPA and ESA violations and for the Forest Service to issue a new decision no later than December 31, 2011.

Estimated Dates

The draft environmental impact statement is expected to be available for public comment early in 2011 and the final EIS is expected to be completed by the fall of 2011.

Purpose and Need for Action

Adopting the proposed action would give the Forest Service the ability to reduce wildfire intensities and rates of spread under certain circumstances until ground forces can safely take suppression action over the duration of an incident. High fire intensities and rates of spread greatly reduce the ability of ground-based firefighters to safely fight wildland fires. In addition, the remote locations and rugged topography associated with many wildland fires can delay the deployment of ground forces for suppression. In some situations, firefighters need the ability to quickly reduce rates of spread and intensities of wildland fires, often in remote locations, and to do so until ground forces can safely take suppression action or until a wildfire is contained or controlled.

Proposed Action

The Forest Service proposes to continue the aerial application of fire retardant to fight fires on National Forest System Lands. Aerial application would be conducted, as it is now, under "Guidelines for Aerial Delivery of Retardant or Foam Near Waterways" (2000 Guidelines) adopted by the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service in April 2000. The 2000 Guidelines are a means to minimize the impact of aerially-delivered fire retardant on aquatic life and habitat. The 2000 Guidelines, available at <http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/fire/retardants/current/gen/appguide.htm> are as follows:

Definition: WATERWAY—Any body of water including lakes, rivers, streams and ponds whether or not they contain aquatic life.

Avoid aerial application of retardant or foam within 300 feet of waterways.

These guidelines do not require the helicopter or airtanker pilot-in-command to fly in such a way as to endanger his or her aircraft, other aircraft, or structures or compromise ground personnel safety.

Guidance for pilots: To meet the 300-foot buffer zone guideline, implement the following:

Medium/Heavy Airtankers: When approaching a waterway visible to the pilot, the pilot shall terminate the