

retooled to serve as a source of irrigation for the nursery. The need for irrigation ceased in 1997 with the closure of the nursery. (2) *Recreation*—Hemlock Lake has continued to provide recreational opportunities since the dam was constructed. While the lake conditions and uses have changed over time, the lake currently provides a shallow, warm water play area popular with people of all ages during the summer months, particularly families with young children. Removing the dam would mean a loss of the lake and the current recreation opportunities. (3) *Wetlands*—Over time, wetlands have developed in the backwaters of Hemlock Lake and now support plant and animal species that rely on wetland habitat. Removing the dam could reduce or eliminate these unique habitats, as well as affect pond-dwelling species.

Two alternatives to full dam removal provided by the WSU study address the above issues, in whole or part: (1) Notch the dam, construct a new fish ladder, and create an "off-channel" pond for recreation opportunities; (2) leave the dam in place, dredge the reservoir, and construct a new fish ladder.

Permits required for dam removal include the Hydrologic Permit Approval (HPA) from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife; Approval to Allow Temporary Exceedance of Water Quality Standards from the Washington Department of Ecology; Section 404 permit to discharge or excavate dredged or fill material and mechanized land clearing in waters, including wetlands, from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; a Section 401 Water Quality Certification issued by the Department of Ecology under 33 U.S.C. 401 and 1344; and a Shoreline Substantial Development, Conditional Use, Variance permit, or Exemption required for work activity in the 100-year floodplain, issued by Skamania County, Washington.

This Notice and subsequent scoping notices will satisfy the requirements under 36 CFR 800.2(d) for seeking the views of the public on the potential effects of an undertaking on historic properties. A public open house was held on May 31, 2001, in Stevenson, Washington to provide information about the dam, status of the steelhead in the Wind River system, and opportunities for improving fish passage and habitat, including removal of the dam. The specific need and format for additional meetings and workshops will be determined by the comments received from the May open house, this notice, and responses by individuals and organization contacted via the Hemlock Dam EIS Scoping

Communication Plan. A web site will be established in the near future on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest World Wide Web to enable interested parties to access project information directly.

Continued scoping and public participation efforts will be used by the interdisciplinary planning team to identify new issues, develop alternatives in response to the issues, and determine the level of analysis needed to disclose potential biological, physical, economic and social impacts associated with the project. The Forest Service is seeking information, comments, and assistance from other agencies, organizations or individuals who may be interested in or affected by the proposed project. The input will be used in preparation of the draft EIS. The scoping process will be used to:

Identify potential issues;

Identify major issues to be analyzed in depth;

Identify alternatives to the proposed action; and

Identify potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternatives (i.e., direct, indirect, and cumulative effects).

The draft EIS is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review by September 2002. The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the notice of availability is published 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 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.

The final EIS is anticipated to be completed by December, 2003. In the final EIS, the Forest Service is required to respond to substantive comments received during the comment period for the draft EIS. Gregory L. Cox, Mount Adams District Ranger, is the Responsible Official. He will decide, which, if any, of the proposed project alternatives will be implemented. His decision and reasons for the decision will be documented in the Record of Decision, which will be subject to Forest Service Appeal Regulations (36 CFR part 217).

Dated: August 9, 2001.

Claire Lavendel,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 01-20621 Filed 8-15-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Supplement to Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Silvies Canyon Watershed Restoration Project, Malheur National Forest, Grant and Harney Counties, OR

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent to supplement a draft environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The USDA Forest Service will prepare a supplement to the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Silvies Canyon Watershed Restoration Project. The draft EIS for the Silvies Canyon Watershed Restoration Project was released by Forest Supervisor Bonnie J. Wood in March 2001 (Notice of Availability, March 9, 2001). Based on comments received on the draft EIS, the Forest Supervisor decided to prepare a supplement pursuant to 40 CFR 1502.9(c)(1)(ii). This

supplement will provide additional information to the existing analysis.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments and suggestions concerning the scope of this supplement to James M. Keniston, Emigrant Creek District Ranger, HC 74, Box 12870, Hines, Oregon 97738.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lori Bailey, District Planner or Joan Suther, NEPA Coordinator, Emigrant Creek Ranger District, HC 74, Box 12870, Hines, Oregon 97738, phone 541-573-4300.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of the supplement is to provide additional information on the social and economic environments that would be affected by the Silvies Canyon Watershed Restoration Project. No additional alternatives will be considered in the supplemental draft EIS. The supplement will be prepared and circulated in the same manner as the draft EIS (40 CFR 1502.9). Comments received on the supplement will be considered in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The supplement to the draft EIS is expected to be available for public review and comment in August 2001. The comment period on the supplement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency's notice of availability appears in the **Federal Register**.

The Forest Service believes it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of supplemental draft EIS 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 EIS stage, but that are not raised until completion of the final EIS, may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F. 2d 1016, 1002 (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 important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45-day comment period so 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.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the supplemental draft

EIS should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the supplemental draft EIS. Comments may also address the adequacy of the supplemental draft EIS 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).

After the 45 day comment period ends on the supplemental draft EIS, comments will be analyzed and considered by the Forest Service in preparing the final EIS. The final EIS is scheduled to be completed in November 2001. In the final EIS, the Forest Service is required to respond to substantive comments received during the public comment period. The Forest Service is the lead agency. The Forest Supervisor is the responsible official. The responsible official will consider comments, responses to comments, and environmental consequences discussed in the EIS, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making a decision regarding this project. The responsible official will document the Silvies Canyon Watershed Restoration decision and rationale for that decision in the Record of Decision. That decision will be subject to review under Forest Service Appeal Regulations (36 CFR part 215).

Dated: July 23, 2001.

Bonnie J. Wood,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 01-20622 Filed 8-15-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[I.D. 081301A]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce 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: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Title: Saltonstall-Kennedy Grant Program (S-K Program) Applications and Reports.

Form Number(s): NOAA Forms 88-204 and 88-205.

OMB Approval Number: 0648-0135.

Type of Request: Regular submission.

Burden Hours: 985.

Number of Respondents: 210.

Average Hours Per Response: 1 hour for a project budget, 1 hour for a project summary, 2.5 hours for a semi-annual progress report, and 13 hours for a final report.

Needs and Uses: The S-K Program provides financial assistance on a competitive basis for research and development projects that benefit U.S. fishing communities. Respondents must submit applications, and grant recipients must submit semi-annual progress reports and final reports.

Affected Public: Not-for-profit institutions, business or other for-profit organizations, individuals, and State, Local, or Tribal government.

Frequency: On occasion, semi-annually, annually.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

OMB Desk Officer: David Rostker, (202) 395-3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Madeleine Clayton, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, (202) 482-3129, Department of Commerce, Room 6086, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at MClayton@doc.gov).

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: August 9, 2001.

Madeleine Clayton,

*Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer,
Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 01-20653 Filed 8-15-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 1184]

Designation of New Grantee for Foreign-Trade Zone 209, Palm Beach County, Florida; Resolution and Order

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), and the Foreign-Trade Zones Board Regulations (15 CFR part 400), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

The Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) has considered the application (filed 6/4/2001) submitted by the Port of Palm