and West Virginia. Based on its finding of no significant impact, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that an environmental impact statement need not be prepared.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Richard Chipman, Rabies Program Coordinator, Wildlife Services, APHIS, 59 Chennell Drive, Suite 7, Concord, NH 03301; (603) 223–9623. To obtain copies of the supplement to the environmental assessment or finding of no significant impact, contact Ms. Beth Kabert, Environmental Coordinator, Wildlife Services, 140–C Locust Grove Road, Pittstown, NJ 08867; (908) 735–5654, fax (908) 735–0821, email: beth.e.kabert@aphis.usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background
The Wildlife Services (WS) program of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) cooperates with Federal agencies, State and local governments, and private individuals to research and implement the best methods of managing conflicts between wildlife and human health and safety, agriculture, property, and natural resources. Wildlife-borne diseases that can affect domestic animals and humans are among the types of conflicts that APHIS–WS addresses. Wildlife is the dominant reservoir of rabies in the United States.

On August 16, 2012, APHIS–WS published in the Federal Register (77 FR 49409–49410, Docket No. APHIS–2012–0052) a notice 1 announcing the availability of an environmental assessment (EA) and finding of no significant impact (FONSI) pertaining to the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of a field trial to test the safety and efficacy of an experimental oral rabies vaccine for wildlife in New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Vermont, and West Virginia. Based on the FONSI, we determined that an environmental impact statement need not be prepared.

On June 5, 2013, we published in the Federal Register (78 FR 33798–33799, Docket No. APHIS–2013–0046) a notice 2 in which we announced the availability, for public review and comment, of a supplement to the earlier EA. Our objectives in issuing the supplement to the EA were as follows:

- To examine the potential environmental impacts of expanding the geographic range of the field trial zone in New York;
- To examine the potential environmental impacts of the field trial in relation to new information that has become available from public comments, research findings, and data gathering since the issuance of the 2012 FONSI;
- To clearly communicate to the public our analysis of the individual and cumulative impacts of the field trial since 2012; and
- To document our analysis of our field-trial activities in New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Vermont, and West Virginia since the 2012 FONSI was issued to ensure that program activities remain within the impact parameters analyzed in the original EA.

We solicited comments on the supplement to the EA for 30 days ending July 5, 2013. We received one comment by that date. It was from a private citizen who had already submitted five comments on the original EA. The comment contained no new information.

In this document, we are advising the public of the availability of an updated FONSI regarding the potential environmental impact associated with our oral rabies vaccine field trial. The finding, which is based on the EA and the supplement to the EA, reflects our determination that the distribution of this experimental wildlife rabies vaccine will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

The supplement to the EA and the updated FONSI may be viewed on the Regulations.gov Web site (see footnote 2) or in our reading room, which is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 799–7039 before coming.

This notice and the supplemental environmental assessment are also posted on the APHIS Web site at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/regulations/ws/ws_nepa_environmental_documents.shtml. In addition, copies may be obtained from the person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.

The supplement to the EA and FONSI have been prepared in accordance with:

(1) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); (2) regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508); (3) USDA regulations implementing NEPA (7 CFR part 1b); and (4) APHIS' NEPA Implementing Procedures (7 CFR part 372).

Done in Washington, DC, this 12th day of August 2013.

Kevin Shea, Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2013–19835 Filed 8–13–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Notice: APHIS–2013–0056]

Wildlife Services Policy on Wildlife Damage Management in Urban Areas

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We are advising the public that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service’s Wildlife Services (APHIS–WS) program is making a policy decision on how to define “urban rodent control,” as referred to in the Act of December 22, 1987. This action is necessary to make it clearer when APHIS–WS may or may not conduct activities and enter into agreements in order to control nuisance rodent species or those rodent species that are reservoirs for zoonotic diseases.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background
Wildlife is a publicly owned natural resource in the United States, and State and Federal wildlife agencies have an affirmative duty and responsibility to administer, protect, manage and conserve fish and wildlife. The mission of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service’s Wildlife Services (APHIS–WS) program is to provide Federal leadership in managing problems caused by wildlife. This includes determining and implementing both research of and methods for controlling animal species that are injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, endangered and threatened species, other natural
resources, property, and that create a risk to human health and safety. To this end,APHIS–WS cooperates with Federal agencies, State and local governments, and private individuals to research and implement the best methods of managing conflicts between wildlife and human health and safety, agriculture, property, and natural resources.

Under the Act of December 22, 1987 (7 U.S.C. 426c), APHIS–WS is authorized, except for urban rodent control, to conduct activities and enter into agreements to control nuisance bird and mammal species or those bird and mammal species that are reservoirs of zoonotic diseases. While the Act makes an exception for urban rodent control, it does not define the term. This has led to confusion about when APHIS–WS may provide wildlife damage control assistance and has created an overlap in services with private sector pest control companies in urban and suburban areas.

The term “rodent” refers to the group of mammals that includes rats, mice, chipmunks, squirrels, porcupines, and groundhogs, among other species. Therefore, to maximize Federal resources and reduce duplication of services, we are considering “urban rodent control,” for the purposes of activities authorized by the Act of December 22, 1987, to mean actions to directly control mice, rats, voles, squirrels, chipmunks, gophers, and woodchucks/groundhogs in a city or town with a population greater than 50,000 inhabitants, as well as the urbanized area contiguous and adjacent to such a city or town.

There are some categories of actions for which APHIS will continue to consider requests for operational assistance. Specifically, actions involving Federal agencies; government entities engaged in a cooperative service agreement with APHIS to provide direct control of rodents as of October 1, 2013; a State in which direct control of the rodent species has been expressly authorized by State law, rulemaking, or a local jurisdiction’s ordinance promulgated by public notice and an opportunity for public comment or as otherwise promulgated as required and authorized by the respective State or local law; and railways and airport air side areas are excluded from this definition. Otherwise, APHIS will refer all requests for operational assistance with urban rodent control from private entities such as home and business owners and associations to private sector pest control companies.

Done in Washington, DC, this 12th day of 2013.
Kevin Shea,
Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Forest Service
Lyman-Mineral County Resource Advisory Committee
AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.
ACTION: Notice of meetings.

SUMMARY: The Lyman-Mineral County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) will meet in Yerrington, Nevada. The RAC is meeting as authorized under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (Pub. L. 110–343) and in compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The RAC's purpose is to improve collaborative relationships and to provide advice and recommendations to the Forest Service concerning projects and funding consistent with Title II of the Act. The meeting is open to the public. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the reduced funding and possible distribution for the 5th year Title II projects.

DATES: The meetings will be held at 10:00 a.m. on the following dates:
• September 3rd, 2013
• September 11th, 2013
• September 25th, 2013

ADDRESSES: The meetings will be held at the Commissioners Meeting Room, Lyon County Administration Complex, 27 South Main Street, Yerrington, Nevada. Written comments may be submitted as described under SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

SUMMARY: This Notice announces the funds available for loans and grants under the Rural Microentrepreneur Assistance Program (RMAP) pursuant to Title II of the Secure Rural Schools Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110–343) for fiscal year (FY) 2013.

Total Funding: $12,224,613.35
Technical Assistance (TA) Only Grants: $300,000
Microlender TA Grants: $1,209,696.97
Loans: $10,714,916.38

The minimum loan amount a Microenterprise Development Organization (MDO) may borrow under this program is $50,000. The maximum loan any MDO may borrow in any given year is $500,000. The maximum amount of Technical Assistance (TA)–only grants in FY 2013 is $30,000 per grante and total TA-only grants funding will not exceed 10 percent of