

*Phase II of ESPH*

Child intercepts—200 respondents × 4 locations = 800 respondents (padded to 1000)

Adult intercepts—200 respondents × 4 locations = 800 respondents (padded to 1000)

Child focus groups—24 grps × 12 respondents/grp = 288 respondents (padded to 300)

Adult focus groups—32 grps × 12 respondents/grp = 384 respondents (padded to 400)

Professional staff—120 respondents  
Total = 2272 respondents (padded up to 2700)

*Phase II of ESPH Web Site Development*

Total = 300 respondents

*Dietary Guidelines Low-Literacy Materials*

English-speaking intercepts—80 respondents (padded to 100)

Spanish-speaking intercepts—80 respondents (padded to 100)

English-speaking focus groups—12 groups × 10 respondents = 120 respondents

Spanish-speaking focus groups—12 groups × 10 respondents = 120 respondents

Professional staff—30 respondents (padded to 60)

Total = 430 respondents (padded up to 500)

*Spanish Conversion*

Spanish focus groups—12 groups × 10 respondents = 120 respondents

Spanish intercepts—112 respondents (padded to 130)

Total = 232 respondents (padded to 250)

*Grand Total* = 3750 respondents.

*Number of Responses per*

*Respondent*: 15.

*Estimated Time per Response*:

*Total Interviews (one on one interviews)* = 2810 × 30 min (per contractor) = 84,300/60 = 1405 hours.

*Total Focus Groups* = 1060 × 2 hrs (per contractor) = 2120 hours.

*Total Estimated Hours of Burden not to exceed* = 3525 hours.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents*: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 3750 respondents with a total estimated burden of 3525 hours.

Dated: December 5, 2001.

**George A. Braley,**

*Acting Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service.*

[FR Doc. 01-30835 Filed 12-13-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-30-U

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## Forest Service

**Newspapers Used for Publication of Legal Notice of Appealable Decisions for the Northern Region; Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, and Portions of South Dakota and Eastern Washington**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice lists the newspapers that will be used by all Ranger Districts, Forests, and the Regional Office of the Northern Region to publish legal notice of all decisions subject to appeal under 36 CFR parts 215 and 217 and to publish notices for public comment and notice of decision subject to the provisions of 36 CFR part 215. The intended effect of this action is to inform interested members of the public which newspapers will be used to publish legal notices for public comment or decisions; thereby allowing them to receive constructive notice of a decision, to provide clear evidence of timely notice, and to achieve consistency in administering the appeals process.

**DATES:** Publication of legal notices in the listed newspapers will begin with decisions subject to appeal that are made on or after December 14, 2001. The list of newspapers will remain in effect until another notice is published in the **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Appeals and Litigation Group Leader; Northern Region; PO Box 7669; Missoula, Montana 59807. Phone: (406) 329-3696.

The newspapers to be used are as follows:

*Northern Regional Office.*—Regional Forester decisions in Montana:

The Missoulian, Great Falls Tribune, and the Billings Gazette.

Regional Forester decisions in Northern Idaho and Eastern Washington: The Spokesman Review. Regional Forester decisions in North Dakota: Bismarck Tribune.

Regional Forester decisions in South Dakota: Rapid City Journal.

*Beaverhead/Deerlodge*—Montana

Standard

*Bitterroot*—Ravalli Republic

*Clearwater*—Lewiston Morning Tribune

*Custer*—Billings Gazette (Montana)

Rapid City Journal (South Dakota)

*Dakota Prairie National Grasslands*—

Bismarck Tribune (North Dakota)

Rapid City Journal (South Dakota)

*Flathead*—Daily Interlake

*Gallatin*—Bozeman Chronicle

*Helena*—Independent Record  
*Idaho Panhandle*—Spokesman Review  
*Kootenai*—Daily Interlake  
*Lewis & Clark*—Great Falls Tribune  
*Lolo*—Missoulian  
*Nez Perce*—Lewiston Morning Tribune

Supplemental notices may be placed in any newspaper, but time frames/deadlines will be calculated based upon notices in newspapers of record listed above.

Dated: December 7, 2001.

**Kathleen A. McAllister,**

*Deputy Regional Forester.*

[FR Doc. 01-30861 Filed 12-13-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## Forest Service

**Salmon-Challis National Forest Noxious Weed Environmental Impact Statement; Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for a Proposed Forest-Wide Noxious Weed Management Program**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The USDA, Forest Service is gathering information and preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a forest-wide noxious weed management program. The intent of this program is to: Protect the natural condition and biodiversity of ecosystems by preventing and/or limiting the introduction and subsequent spread of invasive, non-native plant species that displace native vegetation; eliminate new invaders before they become established; contain and reduce known and potential weed seed sources throughout the forest; prevent or limit the spread of established weeds into areas containing little or no infestation; protect sensitive and unique habitats including research natural areas, wetlands, riparian areas, and sensitive plant populations; and develop criteria to prioritize invasive weed species and treatment areas. Prioritization will be given to treating areas that may contribute to the spread of weeds into Lemhi, Custer, and Butte Counties within the Salmon-Challis National Forest (S-CNF).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Background**

The Salmon-Challis NF embraces Integrated Pest Management (IPM) practices (as defined in Forest Service Handbook 3409) in managing various pests, including noxious and invasive non-native weeds. This philosophy is

predicated on the principle that a single management method will not be successful; but that implementing a fully integrated approach in weed management significantly improves the chances of a successful program. A variety of activities can be carried out under an IPM program and provides for a full range of management strategies, including prevention and public education.

Weeds can alter ecosystem processes, including productivity, decomposition, hydrology, nutrient cycling, and natural disturbance patterns such as frequency and intensity of wildfires. Changing these processes can lead to displacement of native plant species, eventually impacting wildlife and native plant habitat, recreational opportunities, natural hydrologic processes, and scenic beauty. The economic effects from the subsequent loss of productivity and resource values can be considerable.

The Draft EIS will focus on restoring native species and wildlife habitat while reducing runoff and erosion by containing and reducing weed infestations and seed sources throughout the forest, controlling the spread of existing weeds, and preventing the establishment of new weed species. This project will encompass portions of the S-CNF, with complete analysis expected by January 2003.

### EIS Scope

Potential alternatives for weed management may include mechanical, biological, vegetative (e.g. seedings), controlled grazing, and ground-based and aerial herbicide applications. Methods of management will be evaluated based on environmental concerns, management restrictions, and site characteristics to ensure weed management activities are as successful as possible. The project area and analysis will encompass the entire Salmon-Challis National Forest excluding the Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness, an area of approximately 3,108,827 acres. Specific treatment areas may be throughout the project area and would include big game summer and winter range, roads, trails, trailheads, administrative sites, and other emphasis areas such as disturbed sites and high use areas. preliminary issues identified for analysis in the EIS include the potential effects and relationship of the project to human health risk, water quality, fisheries, native plant communities, wildlife habitat, soil productivity, recreation, scenery, heritage resources, and sensitive plants.

### Public Involvement

The Forest Service intends to schedule at least three public information meetings before the close of the comment period. For the Forest Service to best use the scoping input, comments should be received by January 31, 2002.

Public participation will be an integral component of the study process, and will be especially important at several points during the analysis. The first is during the scoping process. The Forest Service will be seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, County, and local agencies, individuals, and organizations that may be interested in or affected by the proposed activities. The scoping process will include: (1) Identification of potential issues, (2) identification of issues to be analyzed in depth, (3) identification of alternatives and (4) elimination of non-significant issues or those that have been covered by previous environmental reviews. Written scoping comments will be solicited through a scoping package that will be sent to the project mailing list and local newspapers.

At this early stage, 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 Draft EIS's 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 have been 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, 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 on the Draft EIS, so that substantive comments and any objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when they can be meaningfully considered and responded to in the Final EIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns of the proposed action, comments on the Draft EIS should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the Draft EIS. Comments may address the adequacy of the Draft

EIS, as well as the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the Draft EIS. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act in 40 CFR 1503.3, in addressing these points.

**DATES:** Dates, times and locations of these meetings will be announced. Written comments concerning the scope of this project should be received by the Salmon-Challis National Forest by January 31, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Please send written comments to: Salmon-Challis National Forest, 50 Highway 93 South, Salmon, ID 83467. Attn: Lyle Powers, RE: Salmon-Challis NF Noxious Weed EIS.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lyle Powers, Planning Staff Officer, telephone (208) 756-5557, E-mail: [lepowers@fs.fed.us](mailto:lepowers@fs.fed.us), or Bill Diage, Planning Team Ecologist, telephone (208) 756-5562, E-mail: [wdiage@fs.fed.us](mailto:wdiage@fs.fed.us), Salmon-Challis National Forest, 50 Highway 93 South, Salmon, ID 83467.

**Permits/Authorizations:** The proposed action will not require any site-specific amendments to the Salmon nor Challis National Forest Land and Resource Management Plans.

**Responsible Official:** George Matejko, Forest Supervisor, Salmon-Challis National Forest, is the responsible official. In making the decision, the responsible official will consider the comments; responses; disclosure of environmental consequences; and applicable laws, regulations, and policies. The responsible official will state the rationale for the chosen alternative in the Record of Decision.

Dated: December 7, 2001.

**George Matejko,**  
Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 01-30885 Filed 12-13-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### **B-Line Phase III (Sewer Export Pipeline Replacement), Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU), El Dorado County, California; Notice of Intent**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

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

**SUMMARY:** The USDA Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) to address whether or