

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 203(c) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627), as amended, directs and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture (To develop and improve standards of quality, condition, quantity, grade and packaging and recommend and demonstrate such standards in order to encourage uniformity and consistency in commercial practices.) AMS is committed to carrying out this authority in a manner that facilitates the marketing of agricultural commodities. AMS makes copies of official standards available upon request. The United States Standards for Grades of Fruits and Vegetables not connected with Federal Marketing Orders or U.S. Import Requirements no longer appear in the Code of Federal Regulations, but are maintained by USDA, AMS, Fruit and Vegetable Programs.

AMS is considering revisions to the voluntary United States Standards for Grades of Cantaloups using procedures that appear in Part 36, Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (7 CFR part 36). These standards were last revised on June 30, 1968.

### Background

AMS has been reviewing the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable grade standards for usefulness in serving the industry. AMS has identified the United States Standards for Grades of Cantaloups for possible revision. Prior to undertaking detailed work developing the proposed revisions in the standards, AMS is soliciting comments on the proposed revisions on the United States Standards for Grades of Cantaloups to better serve the industry.

AMS is considering revising the “Application of Tolerances” section in the U.S. standards by replacing the phrase “The contents of individual packages \* \* \* ” with “Samples \* \* \* ” and revising “(a) A package may contain \* \* \* ” to “(a) Samples may contain \* \* \* ” This change is needed in order to make the “Application of Tolerances” applicable to larger containers, such as bins, which may contain several hundred melons.

AMS is also eliminating the “Unclassified” category. AMS is removing this section in all standards as they are revised. This category is not a grade and only serves to show that no grade has been applied to the lot. It is no longer considered necessary due to current marketing practices.

This notice provides for a 60-day comment period for interested parties to comment on the proposed changes to the United States Standards for Grades of Cantaloups. Should AMS go forward

with the revisions, it will develop the proposed revised standards that will be published in the **Federal Register** with a request for comments in accordance with 7 CFR part 36.

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 1621–1627.

Dated: December 21, 2006

**Lloyd C. Day,**

*Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.*

[FR Doc. E6–22235 Filed 12–27–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–02–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS–2006–0172]

#### Interstate Movement of Garbage from Hawaii; Availability of a Pest Risk Assessment and an Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

**AGENCY:** Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** We are advising the public that a pest risk assessment and an environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact have been prepared by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service relative to a request to allow the interstate movement of garbage from Hawaii to a landfill in the State of Washington. The pest risk assessment evaluates the risks associated with the interstate movement of garbage from Hawaii to Washington. The environmental assessment examines the potential environmental effects associated with moving garbage interstate from Hawaii to Washington, subject to certain pest risk mitigation measures and documents our review and analysis of the environmental impacts associated with, and alternatives to, the action. Based on its finding of no significant impact, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that an environmental impact statement need not be prepared.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Shannon Hamm, Assistant Deputy Administrator, Policy and Program Development, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 20, Riverdale, MD 20737–1231; (301) 734–4957.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The importation and interstate movement of garbage is regulated by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection

Service (APHIS) under 7 CFR 330.400 and 9 CFR 94.5 (referred to below as the regulations) in order to protect against the introduction into and dissemination within the United States of plant and animal pests and diseases.

On November 8, 2006, we published in the **Federal Register** (71 FR 65454, Docket No. APHIS–2006–0172) a notice in which we announced the availability, for public review and comment of, a site-specific environmental assessment and a pest risk assessment relative to a request to allow the interstate movement of garbage from Hawaii to the State of Washington.

The environmental assessment, titled “Movement of Plastic-baled Municipal Solid Waste from Honolulu, Hawaii to Roosevelt Regional Landfill, Washington” (October 2006), examines the potential environmental effects associated with moving garbage interstate from Hawaii to the Roosevelt Regional Landfill in Klickitat County, WA, subject to certain pest risk mitigation measures. The environmental assessment documents our review and analysis of environmental impacts associated with, and alternatives to, the proposed action.

The pest risk assessment, titled “The Risk of Introduction of Pests to Washington State via Plastic-Baled Municipal Solid Waste from Hawaii” (September 2006), evaluates the plant pest risks associated with the interstate movement of garbage from Hawaii to the Roosevelt Regional Landfill.

We solicited comments on the site-specific environmental assessment and the pest risk assessment for 30 days ending on December 8, 2006. We received five comments by that date, from three private citizens and two representatives of local municipalities. Of the comments, only one specifically addressed the substance of either assessment. That commenter noted that the environmental assessment incorrectly stated the capacity of the Roosevelt Regional Landfill. We have updated our environmental assessment to reflect the capacity reported by the commenter.

One commenter questioned if a copy of the pest risk assessment had been made available for the public to view. The pest risk assessment was made available to the public in several ways. Our November 2006 notice of availability contained specific instructions for obtaining both electronic and paper copies of the pest risk assessment.

One commenter disagreed with the idea of moving garbage from Hawaii to the mainland, asking how we can be sure the garbage does not harbor deadly

diseases or tiny animals. We believe that the pest risk assessment provides a thorough analysis of risks presented, and that those risks are fully addressed by the baling technology and other safeguards that will be required.

One commenter requested information on the companies that have expressed interest in sending municipal solid waste (MSW) from Hawaii to Roosevelt Regional Landfill. As noted on page 2 of the pest risk assessment, Pacific Rim Environmental Resources and Hawaii Waste Systems have proposed moving baled MSW from Hawaii to a landfill in Washington State. Another commenter asked who initiated the request for an environmental assessment and if these assessments are done routinely by APHIS. For this particular action, APHIS does routinely prepare environmental assessments. As explained in the "Purpose and Need" section of the environmental assessment, APHIS is reviewing two requests to move MSW from Honolulu, HI, to the State of Washington under compliance agreements. APHIS must complete an environmental assessment to evaluate the potential impact on the human environment prior to the issuance of these compliance agreements. The purpose of this review is to determine whether the transport of Hawaiian MSW under compliance agreements would result in a significant impact on the human environment.

One commenter asked what measures would be taken to ensure that unacceptable waste would be segregated from baled waste. APHIS recommends a series of mitigations in the pest risk assessment that would ensure that MSW is separated from prohibited materials and processed and shipped in a way that would prevent the introduction and dissemination of plant pests. Any companies interested in processing and shipping MSW from Hawaii to the mainland would have to enter into a compliance agreement with APHIS and the compliance agreement would spell out all required safeguards. If any company failed to observe the conditions of the compliance agreement, that company would no longer be permitted to process and ship MSW.

Finally, one commenter stated that APHIS should not approve the proposals to ship plastic-baled MSW from Hawaii to the State of Washington. The commenter stated that any decisions regarding the disposition of a community's MSW should be left to the local government. To clarify, the pest risk assessment and the environmental assessment were conducted in order to determine if the movement of MSW

from Hawaii to the mainland of the United States would present any risk of introduction and dissemination of plant pests or animal diseases or if that action would have any negative impacts on the environments. APHIS is satisfied with the conclusions of those assessments. Additionally, APHIS will enter into compliance agreements with companies that wish to move MSW from Hawaii to the mainland United States to ensure that the mitigations and protocols described in our assessments are being followed. It is entirely up to the local jurisdiction as to whether or not the community will avail itself of this potential disposal option for its MSW.

The site-specific pest risk assessment and environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact may be viewed on the Regulations.gov Web site.<sup>1</sup> Copies of the pest risk assessment and environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact are also available for public inspection at USDA, room 1141, South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Persons wishing to inspect copies are requested to call ahead on (202) 690-2817 to facilitate entry into the reading room. In addition, copies may be obtained by writing to the individual listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

The environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact have been prepared in accordance with: (1) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), (2) regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), (3) USDA regulations implementing NEPA (7 CFR part 1), and (4) APHIS' NEPA Implementing Procedures (7 CFR part 372).

Done in Washington, DC, this 21st day of December 2006.

**Kevin Shea,**

*Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*

[FR Doc. E6-22267 Filed 12-27-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-34-P**

<sup>1</sup> Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, click on the "Advanced Search" tab and select "Docket Search." In the Docket ID field, enter APHIS-2006-0172, click "Submit," then click on the Docket ID link in the search results page. The pest risk assessment and the environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact will appear in the resulting list of documents.

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Caribou-Targhee National Forest, ID, WY and UT, Caribou Oil and Gas Leasing EIS

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA and Bureau of Land Management, USDI.

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

**SUMMARY:** The Caribou-Targhee National Forest gives notice of the intent to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) to document the analysis and disclose the anticipated environmental and human effects of oil and gas leasing on the Caribou administrative unit of the Forest and the Curlew National Grassland in southeast Idaho, with minor amounts of land in northern Utah and western Wyoming. The Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987 (FOOGLRA) requires the Forest Service to evaluate National Forest System (NFS) lands for potential oil and gas leasing. As the agency responsible for lease issuance and administration, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) will participate as a cooperating agency.

**DATES:** Comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be received within 45 days from the date of this notice to be most helpful. The draft environmental impact statement is expected by November, 2007 and 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 final environmental impact statement is expected in April, 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Steve Robison, Oil and Gas Team Leader, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, 1405 Hollipark Drive, Idaho Falls, ID 83401. Electronic comments can be submitted in rich text format (.rtf), or Word (.doc) to [comments-intermtn-caribou-targhee@fs.fed.us](mailto:comments-intermtn-caribou-targhee@fs.fed.us).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lynn Ballard, Public Affairs Officer, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, 1405 Hollipark Drive, Idaho Falls, ID 83401; phone (208) 557-5765. For technical information contact: Steve Robison, Oil and Gas Team Leader, (208) 557-5799.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Purpose and Need for Action

FOOGLRA requires the Forest Service to evaluate National Forest System (NFS) lands that are legally open to leasing for potential oil and gas leasing