To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft EIS should be 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 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.

Responsible Official: David D. Rittenhouse, Forest Supervisor, Boise National Forest is the responsible official, 1249 South Vinnell Way, Suite 200, Boise, Idaho 83709.

Dated: July 21, 2000.

David D. Rittenhouse,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 00–19075 Filed 7–27–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Ray's Valley Road Realignment, Uinta National Forest, Utah County, Utah

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

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

SUMMARY: The Uinta National Forest will prepare an environmental impact statement on a proposal to realign the existing Ray's Valley Road (Forest Development Road #051). Ray's Valley road is an arterial road on the Spanish Fork Ranger District, Uinta National Forest. This is a revision to the Notice of Intent published in the **Federal Register** (Vol. 65, No. 104, pp. 34436–34437) on May 30, 2000.

DATES: Comments should be received in writing by August 30, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed to Renee Flanagan, Ray's Valley EIS Team Leader, Uinta National Forest, 88 West 100 North, PO Box 1428, Provo, Utah 84601 or sent by e-mail to rflanagan@fs.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A Notice of Intent for this project was originally published in the **Federal Register** (Volume 65, Number 104, pp. 34436 to 34437) on May 30, 2000. The May 20th NOI contained an error in the scoping dates. This Revision to the NOI provides for another scoping comment period, revises the anticipated completion dates for the Draft and Final environmental impact statements, and updates the name of the project leader and contact.

The Ray's Valley Road is a heavily used travel route that connects with the Diamond Fork Road (Forest Development Road #029), and the Right Fork Hobble Creek Road (Forest Development Road #058) at Springville Crossing. These arterial travel routes provide access for the Wasatch Front to Spanish Fork Canyon, and Utah State Highway 6 via the Diamond Fork and Ray's Valley Roads. They also provide access to and from Utah State Highway 6 and the Strawberry Reservoir Recreation Complex via the Ray's Valley Road.

The surface of the Diamond Fork Road and most of the Ray's Valley Road are asphalt pavement of gravel. However, a portion of the Ray's Valley Road is narrow, winding, and native-surfaced. During inclement weather conditions, the road surface becomes extremely hazardous to travel, and/or impassable.

Some of the existing road lies directly adjacent to tributaries of Diamond Fork Creek. Approximately 1.8 miles of this route are located on soils subject to severe slumping and/or erosion. Due to the proximity of the road to the streams, eroding soil is easily transported into Diamond Fork and Sixth Water Creeks. Diamond Fork Creek provides habitat for Bonneville Cutthroat Trout, a sensitive species. Operation and maintenance costs on this section of road are high. Existing road conditions do not meet Road Management Objectives for an arterial system road. The Forest Service has long planned to realign this road to address these concerns; however, funding has never been available.

The proposed action is to construct the Ray's Valley Road on a new alignment and to obliterate the road on its existing alignment. The purpose and need of the proposed action is to reduce or eliminate these adverse watershed and fisheries impacts, and to provide safer driving conditions, while maintaining a key arterial component of the Forest's travel system.

Preliminary issues: Issues identified at this time include: health and safety; travel management; soils; fisheries; threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant and animal species; and roadless areas.

Possible Alternatives: Three possible alternatives have been identified: (1) No Action—Leave the road in its current condition: (2) Reconstruct Using the Existing Alignment—Reconstruct on the existing alignment and surface the road with crushed aggregate; and (3) Construct on a New Alignment (Proposed Action)—Reconstruct, realign, and obliterate portions of the Ray's Valley Road.

The No Action Alternative would leave the road in current condition. Maintenance would be limited to actions required for passage of high clearance vehicles. The road would remain unsafe during periods of precipitation. Arterial system road standards for capacity and safety would not be addressed by this alternative. Road induced sediment in nearby streams would remain at current levels, or increase as erosion of the roadway continues.

The Reconstruct Existing Alignment Alternative would reconstruct the road on its existing alignment and add a crushed aggregate surface. Reconstruction would provide better control of drainage from roadway runoff, provide safer and more comfortable vehicle travel during precipitation, and support a greater range of vehicle types. Road induced sediment in nearby streams would slightly decrease due to better drainage and aggregate surfacing. Road Management Objectives for an arterial system road will not be fully accomplished by this alternative due to the location.

The Proposed Action is the Construct New Alignment Alternative. Under this alternative the majority of the existing Ray's Valley Road would be constructed on a new alignment and a small portion would be reconstructed on the existing alignment. The new alignment would be located on more stable soils, and away from streams and riparian areas. The abandoned portions of the existing alignment would be closed and rehabilitated. This proposal would result in approximately 3.6 miles of a double lane road with a crushed aggregate surface. Access to Forest Development Road 715 from the new alignment would be maintained by reconstructing a portion of Forest Development Road 387. This would ensure continued access to the west portal of the Strawberry Tunnel.

Proposed Scoping Process: This Revised Notice of Intent extends the scoping process. As part of the scoping period, the Forest Services solicits public comment on the nature and scope of the environmental, social, and economic issues related to the proposed action that should be analyzed in depth in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Comments on this proposal should be sent to the address shown earlier in this notice.

Public participation will be solicited by notifying affected interests through personal contacts and by mail. This project has been listed in the Uinta National Forests ''Schedule of Proposed Actions'' (*i.e.* NEPA Quarterly). News releases will also be utilized to give the public general notice. Comments concerning the Proposed Action and EIS should address environmental issues to be considered, feasible alternatives to examine, possible mitigation, and information relevant to or bearing on the Proposed Action.

The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

The Forest Service believes it is important to give reviewers notice at this early stage 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 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 are not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement, may be viewed 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 the 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 be meaningfully considered and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying 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 environment 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.

Tentative Project Schedule: Begin Comment Period—April, 2000; Comment Period Ends—August 30, 2000; Draft EIS—December, 2000; Final EIS and Record of Decision—April 2001.

Responsible Official: Jack A. Blackwell, USDA Forest Service Intermountain Regional Forester, 324 25th Street, Ogden, Utah 84401.

For Further Information Contact: Renee Flanagan, (801) 342–5100 or at the address listed previously.

Dated: July 17, 2000.

Peter W. Karp,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 00–19062 Filed 7–27–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Natural Resources Conservation Service

Notice of Proposed Changes to Section IV of the Field Office Technical Guide (FOTG) of the Natural Resources Conservation Service in Ohio

AGENCY: Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) in Ohio, Department of Agriculture.

ACTION: Notice of availability of proposed changes in Section IV of the FOTG of the NRCS in Ohio for review and comment.

SUMMARY: It is the intention of NRCS in Ohio to issue revised conservation practice standards in Section IV of the FOTG. The proposed standard revisions are Nutrient Management (Code 590) and Waste Utilization (Code 633). These practices may be used in conservation systems that involve ''Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plans''.

DATES: Comments will be received on or before August 28, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Inquire in writing to Paul DeArman, Assistant State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), 200 North High Street Room 522, Columbus, Ohio 43215. Copies of these standards will be made available upon written request. You may submit electronic requests and comments to *paul.dearman@oh.nrcs.usda.gov*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 343 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 states that revisions made after the enactment of the law to NRCS State technical guides used to carry out highly erodible land and wetland provisions of the law shall be made available for public review and comment. For the next 30 days the NRCS will receive comments relative to the proposed changes. Following that period a determination will be made by the NRCS regarding the disposition of those comments and a final determination of change will be made.

Dated: July 5, 2000.

J. Kevin Brown,

State Conservationist, Columbus, Ohio.

[FR Doc. 00–19056 Filed 7–27–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–16–P

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

Procurement List; Additions and Deletions

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled

ACTION: Additions to and Deletions from the Procurement List.

SUMMARY: This action adds to the Procurement List commodities and a service to be furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities, and deletes from the Procurement List commodities previously furnished by such agencies.

DATES: *Effective Date:* August 28, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, Jefferson Plaza 2, Suite 10800, 1421 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202–3259.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Louis R. Bartalot (703) 603–7740.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 9 and 16, 2000, the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled published notices (65 FR 36663 and 37757) of proposed additions to and deletions from the Procurement List:

Additions

After consideration of the material presented to it concerning capability of qualified nonprofit agencies to provide the commodities and service and impact of the additions on the current or most recent contractors, the Committee has determined that the commodities and service listed below are suitable for procurement by the Federal Government under 41 U.S.C. 46–48c and 41 CFR 51–2.4.

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were: