

Services (HHS) at 77 FR 4034, January 26, 2012. The guidelines published by HHS are referred to as the poverty guidelines.

Section 246.7(d)(1) of the WIC regulations (Title 7, Code of Federal Regulations) specifies that State agencies may prescribe income guidelines either equaling the income guidelines established under section 9 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act for reduced-price school meals or identical to State or local guidelines for free or reduced-price health care. However, in conforming WIC income guidelines to State or local health care guidelines, the State cannot establish WIC guidelines which exceed the guidelines for

reduced-price school meals, or which are less than 100 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines. Consistent with the method used to compute income eligibility guidelines for reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program, the poverty guidelines were multiplied by 1.85 and the results rounded upward to the next whole dollar. At this time, the Department is publishing the maximum and minimum WIC income eligibility guidelines by household size for the period July 1, 2012, through June 30, 2013. Consistent with section 17(f)(17) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)(17)), a State agency may implement the revised WIC income eligibility guidelines concurrently with

the implementation of income eligibility guidelines under the Medicaid Program established under Title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396, *et seq.*). State agencies may coordinate implementation with the revised Medicaid guidelines, i.e., earlier in the year, but in no case may implementation take place later than July 1, 2012.

State agencies that do not coordinate implementation with the revised Medicaid guidelines must implement the WIC income eligibility guidelines on July 1, 2012. The first table of this Notice contains the income limits by household size for the 48 contiguous States, the District of Columbia, and all Territories, including Guam.

**INCOME ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINES**  
[Effective from July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013]

Household size	Federal poverty guidelines—100%					Reduced price meals—185%				
	Annual	Monthly	Twice-monthly	Bi-weekly	Weekly	Annual	Monthly	Twice-monthly	Bi-weekly	Weekly
<b>48 Contiguous States, D.C., Guam and Territories</b>										
1 .....	\$11,170	\$931	\$466	\$430	\$215	\$20,665	\$1,723	\$862	\$795	\$398
2 .....	15,130	1,261	631	582	291	27,991	2,333	1,167	1,077	539
3 .....	19,090	1,591	796	735	368	35,317	2,944	1,472	1,359	680
4 .....	23,050	1,921	961	887	444	42,643	3,554	1,777	1,641	821
5 .....	27,010	2,251	1,126	1,039	520	49,969	4,165	2,083	1,922	961
6 .....	30,970	2,581	1,291	1,192	596	57,295	4,775	2,388	2,204	1,102
7 .....	34,930	2,911	1,456	1,344	672	64,621	5,386	2,693	2,486	1,243
8 .....	38,890	3,241	1,621	1,496	748	71,947	5,996	2,998	2,768	1,384
Each add'l family member add .....	+3,960	+330	+165	+153	+77	+7,326	+611	+306	+282	+141
<b>Alaska</b>										
1 .....	13,970	1,165	583	538	269	25,845	2,154	1,077	995	498
2 .....	18,920	1,577	789	728	364	35,002	2,917	1,459	1,347	674
3 .....	23,870	1,990	995	919	460	44,160	3,680	1,840	1,699	850
4 .....	28,820	2,402	1,201	1,109	555	53,317	4,444	2,222	2,051	1,026
5 .....	33,770	2,815	1,408	1,299	650	62,475	5,207	2,604	2,403	1,202
6 .....	38,720	3,227	1,614	1,490	745	71,632	5,970	2,985	2,756	1,378
7 .....	43,670	3,640	1,820	1,680	840	80,790	6,733	3,367	3,108	1,554
8 .....	48,620	4,052	2,026	1,870	935	89,947	7,496	3,748	3,460	1,730
Each add'l family member add .....	+4,950	+413	+207	+191	+96	+9,158	+764	+382	+353	+177
<b>Hawaii</b>										
1 .....	12,860	1,072	536	495	248	23,791	1,983	992	916	458
2 .....	17,410	1,451	726	670	335	32,209	2,685	1,343	1,239	620
3 .....	21,960	1,830	915	845	423	40,626	3,386	1,693	1,563	782
4 .....	26,510	2,210	1,105	1,020	510	49,044	4,087	2,044	1,887	944
5 .....	31,060	2,589	1,295	1,195	598	57,461	4,789	2,395	2,211	1,106
6 .....	35,610	2,968	1,484	1,370	685	65,879	5,490	2,745	2,534	1,267
7 .....	40,160	3,347	1,674	1,545	773	74,296	6,192	3,096	2,858	1,429
8 .....	44,710	3,726	1,863	1,720	860	82,714	6,893	3,447	3,182	1,591
Each add'l family member add .....	+4,550	+380	+190	+175	+88	+8,418	+702	+351	+324	+162

Because the poverty guidelines for Alaska and Hawaii are higher than for the 48 contiguous States, separate tables for Alaska and Hawaii have been included for the convenience of the State agencies.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 1786.

Dated: March 19, 2012.

**Jeffrey J. Tribiano,**  
*Acting Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 2012-7037 Filed 3-22-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-30-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

**Forest Service**

**Kootenai National Forest, Cabinet  
Ranger District, Montana Pilgrim  
Timber Sale Project**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

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

**SUMMARY:** This vegetation management project is designed to achieve goals of enhanced forest stand resilience and resistance to insect and disease agents by altering stand density, species composition, and age class structure, via use of timber harvesting and prescribed fire use. Big game forage would be enhanced through use of prescribed fire to rejuvenate and increase palatability of shrubs and grasses, including some sites within Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRA). No mechanical activities are proposed within IRA boundaries.

This Project was originally initiated in 2010 with scoping of the proposed action. In addition, in 2011 public scoping was again initiated in reference to openings sizes exceeding 40 acres and the requirement for a project-specific Forest Plan amendment related to open road density in areas managed for big game summer range. Subsequent analyses of potential environmental effects were documented in an Environmental Assessment (EA). Based on the level of interest, and recognizing the scope and potential issues associated with the project, as the Forest Supervisor for the Kootenai National Forest I have made the decision to halt the EA process and commence with the process to document findings in an Environmental Impact Statement. The comments received during the scoping process for the Environmental Assessment will be used in preparation of the EIS; therefore scoping will not be reinitiated.

**DATES:** Comments concerning the scope of the analysis must be received by April 23, 2012. The draft environmental impact statement is expected May 2012 and the final environmental impact statement is expected September 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Kootenai National Forest, Pilgrim Timber Sale Project, Cabinet Ranger District, 2693 Highway 200, Trout Creek, MT 59874. Comments may also be sent via email to: [comments-northern-kootenai-cabinet-fs.fed.us](mailto:comments-northern-kootenai-cabinet-fs.fed.us), or via facsimile to 406/827-0718. Electronic comments must be submitted in Microsoft Word format. It is important that reviewers provide their comments at such times and in such a way that they are useful to the Agency's preparation of the EIS. Therefore, comments should be provided prior to the close of the comment period and should clearly articulate the reviewer's concerns and contentions specific to the Proposal.

Comments received in response to this solicitation, including the names and addresses of those who comment, will be part of the public record for this

proposed action. Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered, however.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Doug Grupenhoff, Team Leader, (406) 827-3533 or to the Kootenai National Forest Web page: <http://www.fs.fed.us/nepa/fs-usda-pop.php/?project=31645>. Individuals who use telecommunication devices for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday.

Individuals who use telecommunication devices for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday.

#### **Purpose and Need for Action**

There is a need to reduce stand densities, improve growing conditions, and increase the proportion of root disease-resistant tree species in the area; there is a need to increase age class diversity in lodgepole pine-dominated forest communities in the project area; there is a need to provide local employment related to forest management and restoration activities and to supply forest products to contribute to the support of that segment of the local and regional economy dependent on timber products; and, there is a need to improve forage production and quality through the use of such treatments as commercial timber harvest, slashing, and prescribed fire.

#### **Proposed Action**

The proposed action includes timber harvest, prescribed burning, and road work necessary to provide safe access to the proposed treatment areas while minimizing resource impacts, as summarized below:

Approximately 500 acres of regeneration harvest are proposed, most of which would be removed with cable logging systems. Approximately 55-75 acres would be tractor yarded. These treatment areas are generally located where lodgepole pine is susceptible to mountain pine beetle attack or is currently infested, or in areas where Douglas-fir or true firs are infected with root disease at unacceptably high levels. In the latter case, we propose to increase the proportion of root disease resistant species (such as western larch, western white pine, or ponderosa pine) on the site to maintain viable forest communities over time. This can be done by favoring these species in the residual stand or by replanting these species after harvest if they are not well represented in the original stand. For

most areas where regeneration harvest is proposed in lodgepole pine stands, we will generally propose to allow natural revegetation of the site back to lodgepole pine.

Approximately 900 acres of intermediate harvest is proposed; approximately one third will be tractor yarded and two thirds will require the use of a cable system. These commercial thinning treatments would leave a fully stocked stand after harvest with the objective of improving growing conditions for the residual trees.

To access proposed harvest areas, approximately 3.1 miles of new, permanent road would need to be constructed and approximately 1.8 miles of temporary road would be constructed and removed following completion of treatment activities. In addition, approximately 26 miles of road reconditioning to bring roads up to current standards of surface water management and provide for safe hauling. Approximately 6,950 acres have been identified as a perimeter for prescribed burning to enhance forage quality and quantity for big game species, notably elk, deer, and bears. Generally, these areas are on southerly aspects that have historically provided important forage which is declining due to conifer encroachment and forage senescence. Prescribed burns would occur during the cooler, moister spring period when the risk of large, high intensity fires is lower. On a yearly basis, depending on conditions, it is estimated that ignition would be unlikely to exceed 1,000 acres per year.

Portions of three Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) are located within the Project Area and occupy a total of approximately 13,843 acres, or about 46% of the area. There are no harvest activities proposed within these roadless areas. Prescribed burning is being proposed within portions of these IRAs. Burning will be conducted in a manner so as to maintain their natural character and improve wildlife habitat.

Because of the extent of a current mountain pine beetle infestation, larger units are proposed to increase the amount of lodgepole treated and more closely approximate typical patch sizes of lodgepole pine in this area while still protecting important resources including stream integrity and fish habitat. Some of these units would create openings that would exceed 40 acres in size, for which approval by the Regional Forester is generally required.

All action alternatives propose treatment in MA-12 to meet the purpose and need for this project, and this activity requires the use of roads within MA-12 which are currently closed.

Additionally, some alternatives propose new road construction within MA-12. This would result in exceeding the open road density standard during the life of the project and require a site-specific Forest Plan amendment. All roads opened for project activities and all newly constructed roads would be effectively closed after completion of project activities, so there would be no long term increase in open road densities.

Specifically, the proposed action (Alternative 2) would increase ORDs in MA-12 to 2.3 miles per square mile during harvest activities if all roads were open concurrently. Alternative 3 would result in an ORD of 2.6 miles per square mile during operations, and Alternative 4 would not change the existing condition. Following completion of project activities, open road densities would return to pre-project levels.

#### Possible Alternatives

Four alternatives have been identified; the No Action, the Proposed Action described in this Notice of Intent, an action alternative that more specifically addresses concerns and issues related to an on-going, aggressive expansion of mountain pine beetle activity into stands dominated by lodgepole pine, and an action alternative that would address concerns regarding new road construction which would accomplish stand treatments using the existing transportation system.

#### Responsible Official

As the Kootenai National Forest Supervisor, I am the responsible official for this decision.

#### Nature of Decision To Be Made

My decision will be whether or not to implement the proposed action as described, including timber harvest, road work, prescribed burning to enhance big game forage, approval of a project-specific amendment to the Forest Plan for open road density in MA-12, changes in some Management Area designation for difficult regeneration sites, and to exceed the 40 acre opening size limit under the National Forest Management Act (1976), or to implement an alternative course of action, as expressed in alternatives to the proposed action.

#### Scoping Process

It is important that reviewers provide their comments at such times and in such manner that they are useful to the agency's preparation of the environmental impact statement. Therefore, comments should be

provided prior to the close of the comment period and should clearly articulate the reviewer's concerns and contentions.

Comments received in response to this solicitation, including names and addresses of those who comment, will be part of the public record for this proposed action. Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered, however.

Dated: March 8, 2012.

**Paul Stantus,**

*Acting Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 2012-7052 Filed 3-22-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-P**

### OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

#### Review of Federal Permit Conditions

**AGENCY:** Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects is proposing to implement its statutory responsibilities under the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (15 U.S.C. 720) with respect to federal permit conditions imposed on the gas pipeline project. This policy statement will establish the agency's procedures for determining whether certain conditions included in a certificate, right-of-way, permit, lease, or other authorization for an Alaska natural gas transportation project by other federal agencies are prohibited under the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before April 23, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Address all comments concerning this notice to Frank Richards, Deputy Federal Coordinator, Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects; 188 W. Northern Lights Blvd., Suite 600; Anchorage, AK 99503. Submit electronic comments to: [frichards@arcticgas.gov](mailto:frichards@arcticgas.gov).

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Frank Richards, Deputy Federal Coordinator, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects, 907-271-5240.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

Congress enacted the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act in 2004 (15 U.S.C. 720)

to encourage completion of a pipeline to deliver natural gas from Alaska's North Slope to the Lower 48 states. The Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act establishes a new process for approval and construction of the pipeline, either a project that completes the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System that President Carter approved in 1977 pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 719), or a different pipeline project under the Natural Gas Act. The Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act of 2004 created the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects and charged the Federal Coordinator, the agency head, with four primary responsibilities: (1) Coordinate the expeditious discharge of all activities by all federal agencies with respect to an Alaska natural gas pipeline; (2) Ensure that all federal agencies comply with the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act; (3) Prohibit federal agencies from imposing permit conditions that would prevent or impair in any significant respect the expeditious construction and operation of the project unless the conditions are required by law. The act directs the Federal Coordinator to determine whether a term or condition would prevent or impair in any significant respect the expeditious construction and operation of the project; and (4) Participate with the state of Alaska in a joint construction surveillance and monitoring agreement.

In addition, Congress transferred to the Federal Coordinator all of the responsibilities and authorities of the Federal Inspector under the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976. These responsibilities will be applicable if the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System gas line is completed or if the 1980's prebuilt sections of that project are expanded or modified within the United States to handle Alaska gas.

This policy addresses the third of the four statutory requirements listed above by explaining how the Federal Coordinator will determine whether conditions that federal agencies intend to impose on permits, rights-of-way or other authorizations for an Alaska gas transportation project will prevent or impair in any significant respect the expeditious construction and operation of the project.

Several sections of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act require the Federal Coordinator to consider permit conditions imposed by federal agencies with respect to the pipeline. Section 106(d)(2), Public Law 108-324, 118 Stat. 1255 prohibits agencies from including