

In order to further publicize this planning effort, a public announcement was made to State and Federal agencies by letter and to local landowners through local newspapers to announce the change in project purpose.

NRCS scheduled an interdisciplinary, interagency team to work with the Sponsor, landowners, and other interested groups. The team was compiled of specialists from F&WS, EPD, CES, and DNR, along with local operators. The team worked in the watershed area and downstream to Harris Reservoir, to gain insight to the magnitude of the problems and possible solutions. Several meetings, group discussions, and interviews were held with local planners, individuals, government officials and other technical experts. Evaluations and alternative solutions were developed with the Sponsor and other officials. The Recommended Plan was agreed upon.

Another public meeting was on March 30, 2004. The results of surveys, studies, field investigations and the Alternatives Plans were presented to the public. The Selected Plan was agreed upon by those in attendance.

In early 2003, representatives of the NRCS, F&WS, DNR, EPD, and CES made a field inspection to determine the quality and quantity of resources that would be impacted by selected practices and to consider possible mitigation measures. It was the consensus of the group that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was not needed for this project. This agreement was based on the type of practices and systems planned and that each would be installed on previously disturbed land. With this consensus, an Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared accordingly.

Upon review of the Big Cedar Creek Watershed Plan-EA, this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was prepared. These documents are being distributed to all concerned agencies, groups, and interested individuals. A Notice of Availability of the FONSI is being published in the **Federal Register**. Agency consultations and public participation to date has shown no conflicts with the implementation of the selected plan.

Conclusion

The Environmental Assessment summarized above indicates that this Federal action will not cause significant adverse local, regional, or national impacts on the environment. Therefore, based on the above findings, I have determined that an environmental impact statement for the recommended

Big Cedar Creek Revised Watershed Plan is not required.

Dated: June 28, 2005.

James E. Tillman Sr.,
State Conservationist.

[FR Doc. 05-13716 Filed 7-12-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Natural Resources Conservation Service

Caballo Arroyos Site 4 (Wardy-Hedgecock Dam), Doña Ana County, NM

AGENCY: Natural Resources Conservation Service.

ACTION: Notice of a finding of no significant impact.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR Part 1500); and the Natural Resources Conservation Service Rules (7 CFR Part 650); the Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, gives notice that an environmental impact statement is not being prepared for the rehabilitation of Caballo Arroyos Site 4 (Wardy-Hedgecock Dam) in Doña Ana County, New Mexico.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rosendo Treviño III; State Conservationist; Natural Resources Conservation Service; 6200 Jefferson, NE.; Albuquerque, NM 87109-3734; telephone 505-761-4400.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The environmental assessment (EA) of this federally assisted action indicates that the project will not cause significant local, regional, or national effects on the human environment. As a result of these findings, Rosendo Treviño III, State Conservationist, has determined that the preparation and review of an environmental impact statement are not needed for this project.

The project purpose is flood damage reduction. The action includes the rehabilitation of a floodwater retarding dam. The Notice of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) has been forwarded to the Environmental Protection Agency; various Federal, state, and local agencies; and interested parties. A limited number of copies of the FNSI are available to fill single copy requests at the above address. Basic data developed during the EA are on file and may be reviewed by contacting Rosendo Treviño III. No administrative action on implementation of the proposed action

will be taken until 30 days after the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**.

John Gleim,
Acting State Conservationist.

[FR Doc. 05-13717 Filed 7-12-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Business-Cooperative Service

Request for Proposals: Fiscal Year 2005 Funding Opportunity for 1890 Land Grant Institutions Rural Entrepreneurial Program Outreach Initiative

AGENCY: Rural Business-Cooperative Service, USDA.

ACTION: Initial notice.

SUMMARY: The Rural Business-Cooperative Service (RBS) announces the availability of a yet undetermined amount of funding in competitive cooperative agreement funds allocated from USDA Rural Development's fiscal year (FY) 2005 salaries and expense budget. A separate notice will be published when the funding level has been determined. RBS hereby requests proposals from 1890 Land Grant Universities and Tuskegee University (1890 Institutions) for competitively awarded cooperative agreements for projects that support USDA Rural Development's goals and objectives of providing technical assistance for business creation in economically challenged rural communities, for educational programs to develop and improve upon the professional skills of rural entrepreneurs, and for outreach and promotion of USDA Rural Development's programs in small rural communities with the greatest economic need. Project proposals must be designed to overcome currently identified economic problems and lead to sustainable economic development. Project proposals that address both traditional and nontraditional business enterprises are encouraged. This initiative seeks to create a working partnership between USDA Rural Development and the 1890 Institutions through cooperative agreements. A cooperative agreement requires substantial involvement of the government agency in carrying out the objectives of the project.

Cooperative agreements will be awarded to the project proposals receiving the highest scores as determined by a peer review panel of USDA employees knowledgeable of the subject matter. Awards will be made to