

insect pests with biological and chemical insecticides, and use of sanitation; and control of animal pests through mechanical and preventative measures.

In preparing the environmental impact statement, the Forest Service will identify and consider a range of alternative pest management programs. One alternative will be no action. Another alternative will be a pest management program without the use of chemical pesticides. Other alternatives will be pest management programs comprised of various combinations of control methods.

Public participation will be especially important at several points during the analysis. The first point is during the scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7), which includes:

1. Defining the scope of the analysis and nature of the decision to be made.
2. Identifying the issues and determining the significant issues for consideration and analysis within the environmental impact statement.
3. Defining the proper make-up of the interdisciplinary team.
4. Exploring possible alternatives.
5. Identifying potential environmental effects.
6. Determining potential cooperating agencies.
7. Identifying groups or individuals interested or affected by the decision.

The Forest Service will be seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, and local agencies and other individuals or organizations interested in or affected by the proposed action.

Public participation will be solicited by notifying in person and/or by mail known interested and affected publics and key contacts of the scope of the analysis. In addition, news releases will be used to give the public general notice. One public meeting was already held at the Oconto River Seed Orchard on September 21 and others can be held as needed. Input from interested people and organizations will be used in preparation of the draft environmental impact statement.

The preliminary issues identified are: (1) The effect of seed orchard pesticides on human health and the environment; (2) the impact of pest management activities on threatened and endangered species and non-target organisms; (3) the effect of pest management activities on the surrounding community's lifestyle; and (4) the effectiveness of pest control methods.

The draft environmental impact statement is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public

review by August of 1996. At that time, EPA will publish a notice of availability of the draft environmental impact statement in the Federal Register.

The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the EPA's notice of availability appears 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 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 comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at the 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 of Environmental Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Following the comment period on the draft environmental impact statement, comments will be analyzed, considered, and responded to by the Forest Service in preparing the final environmental impact statement. The final environmental impact statement is scheduled to be completed by February of 1997.

The responsible official will consider the comments and responses; environmental consequences discussed in the environmental impact statement; and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making a decision regarding this proposal. The decision and reasons for the decision will be documented in the Record of Decision. That decision will be subject to appeal in accordance with 36 CFR part 217.

Jack G. Troyer, Forest Supervisor, Nicolet National Forest, in Wisconsin, is the responsible official.

Dated: October 2, 1995.

Jack G. Troyer,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 95-25497 Filed 10-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Sequoia National Forest

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The Forest Service will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposed Amendment to the Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) to clarify the standards and guidelines under which commercial livestock grazing may be managed on the Sequoia National Forest, Tulare County, California.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments and suggestions to the responsible official Del A. Pengilly, Acting Forest Supervisor, Sequoia National Forest, 900 W. Grand Avenue, Porterville, California 93257-2035.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Direct questions about the proposed Amendment to Julie Allen, Land Management Planning Officer, Sequoia National Forest, 900 W. Grand Avenue, Porterville, California 93257-2035, telephone (209) 784-1500.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Sequoia National Forest proposes to amend the standards and guidelines in its LRMP in regards to commercial livestock grazing and to evaluate this proposal in an EIS. A range of alternatives for this proposed amendment will be considered and documented in the EIS. One of these will be a no action/no change alternative, essentially leaving the current Land and Resource Management Plan in place. Other alternatives will propose to adopt standards and guidelines regarding commercial livestock grazing including the grazing related portions of the 1990 Mediated Settlement Agreement as is or with modifications.

Intensive scoping for this proposed Forest Plan amendment was done in March and April of 1995. At that time it was thought that this amendment would be analyzed in documented as an environmental assessment. Given the scope of the proposal, and a desire to provide additional procedural opportunities for comment, the Forest Supervisor has decided to document this analysis in an environmental impact statement. By this notice, further scoping comments are invited from any who might not have commented before. Those who have, need not do so again. All input from the public will be considered in preparation of the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS).

The draft EIS (DEIS) is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review by November 1995. At that time EPA will publish a notice of availability of the DEIS in the Federal Register.

The comment period on the DEIS will be 45 days from the date that EPA's Notice of Availability appears in the Federal Register. It is very important that those interested in the management of the Sequoia National Forest participate at that time. To be the most helpful, comments on the DEIS should be as specific as possible and may address the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed (see The Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3). Comments should refer to specific pages or chapters of the DEIS.

Federal court decisions have established that reviewers of DEIS's must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewers' 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 DEIS stage, but that are not raised until after completion of the final EIS, 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 comment period on the DEIS 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 for the draft EIS ends, the comments received will be analyzed and considered by the Forest Service in the preparation of the Final EIS.

Dated: October 6, 1995.

Juliet B. Allen,

Acting Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 95-25486 Filed 10-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Notice of Intent To Prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement To Disclose the Environmental Impacts of Proposed Changes to the Kensington Gold Mine Project; Tongass National Forest, Chatham Area, Juneau Ranger District, Juneau, AK

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice, intent to prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the USDA Forest Service, Chatham Area, under the direction of the Juneau Ranger District, will prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) to analyze and display the effects of proposed changes to the Kensington Gold Project, located on public and private lands in southeastern Alaska. The proposed mine is operated by Coeur Alaska and is located approximately 45 miles north of downtown Juneau. The Record of Decision for the original Final Environmental Impact Statement was signed on January 29, 1992.

DATES: Comments will be accepted throughout the EIS process but, to be most useful during the analysis they should be received in writing by October 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and suggestions concerning the analysis should be sent to Roger Birk, Minerals Management Specialist, Juneau Ranger District, 8465 Old Dairy Road, Juneau, Alaska, 99801.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roger Birk, Minerals Management Specialist, Juneau Ranger District, 8465 Old Dairy Road, Juneau, Alaska 99801; phone (907) 586-8800; fax (907) 586-8808.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed operations are subject to approval of a Plan of Operations under 36 CFR, Part 228, which is intended to ensure that adverse environmental effects on National Forest System lands and resources are minimized. The

proposed changes to the project's Plan of Operations include the following:

1. Advanced water treatment of the flotation tailings and dewatered CIL effluent with underground tailings disposal.
2. Avalanche control and management.
3. Discharge of treated tailings pond effluent to Sherman Creek with flow augmentation to meet end-of-pipe discharge standards.
4. New laydown area/helicopter pad relocation.
5. Use of diesel fuel for power generation rather than LPG (liquified petroleum gas).
6. Temporary construction camp.

The purpose and need for the proposed amendments to the Plan of Operations is to reduce potential impacts to commercial fisheries from a mixing zone in saltwater, reduce risks from avalanches, and increase the economic efficiency of the mine.

In addition to the Forest Service, the Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have jurisdiction and will participate as cooperating agencies in the preparation of the SEIS. The Forest Service has agreed to be the lead agency. EPA will be responsible for assuring that the analysis provides sufficient information for issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit under authority of the Clean Water Act. The Corps will be responsible for ensuring that the analysis provides sufficient information for issuance of a Section 404 of the Clean Water Act permit, Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 permit, and for compliance with Executive Order 11990 and 11900 for wetlands and floodplains. Memorandums of Understanding will be initiated with both of the cooperating agencies.

The decision to be made is whether or not to approve the Plan of Operations as amended or require the operator to revise its proposal. The original FEIS analyzed the effects of developing the Kensington Gold Project. The SEIS will analyze only the effects of the proposed changes to the Plan of Operations.

Key resources to be analyzed include water quality from the discharge to Sherman Creek; impacts to wetlands; impacts to fisheries from the discharge; visual and water quality effects and stability of disturbed areas such as the laydown area, new fuel tank sites, and avalanche control areas; air quality effects from diesel power generation; spill potential and effects of hauling and handling additional diesel fuel.

Gary A. Morrison, Forest Supervisor, Tongass National Forest, Chatham Area, is the responsible official.

The Forest Service is seeking information and comments from