

Number of Responses per Respondent: 2.53.

Total Number of Annual Responses: 1,404,718.

Estimated Time per Response: 0.09.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 135,393.

Dated: February 22, 2008.

Roberto Salazar,

Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service.

[FR Doc. E8-3750 Filed 2-27-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Idaho; Big Bend Ridge Vegetation Management Project and Timber Sale Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Targhee Forest Plan Amendment

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Cancellation of notice of intent to prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement that was published on May 30, 2007, on page 29948 of the **Federal Register**.

SUMMARY: After review of the proposal and public comments on the project the Caribou-Targhee National Forest has decided not to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Big Bend Ridge Vegetation Management Project and Timber Sale and the associated Targhee Forest Plan amendment at this time. The Forest will propose to amend the Targhee Revised Forest Plan under a separate proposal in the near future.

DATES: Effective cancellation of this project upon the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robbin Redman at the Caribou-Targhee National Forest at 1405 Hollipark Drive, Idaho Falls, ID 83401 or via telephone at (208) 557-5821.

Dated: February 20, 2008.

Larry Timchak,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 08-862 Filed 2-27-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Sierra National Forest; California; Kings River Project

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare a supplement to the Kings River Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: The Forest Service will prepare a supplement to the 2006 Kings River Project Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The supplement will be focused on new information and clarification, particularly related to Pacific fisher; a new multi-forest Land Management Plan Amendment regarding management indicator species; applicable suggestions in a new paper titled *An Ecosystem Management Strategy for Southern Sierra Mixed-Conifer Forests* by North, M., P. Stine, K. O'Hara, W. Zielinski and S. Stephens; and collaboration that may result in a change in the timing, description, and location of activities within the project area.

DATES: Scoping is not required for supplements to environmental impact statements (40 CFR 1502.9(c)(4)(4)). The draft supplement to the FEIS is expected to be issued in April 2008 and the final supplement to the FEIS is expected in July 2008. Comments on the draft supplement to the FEIS must be received by 45 days after publication.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Ray Porter, District Ranger, High Sierra Ranger District, PO Box 559, Prather, CA 93651, Attn: Kings River Project Supplement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ross Peckinpah, Kings River Project Coordinator, at the High Sierra Ranger District. Telephone number is (559) 855-5355 x3350. Information regarding the Kings River Project can be found on the Sierra National Forest Web site located at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/sierra/projects/>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Kings River planning area encompasses approximately 131,500 acres of public lands in two watersheds of the Kings River drainage. The northern edge of the project is located about two miles southeast of Shaver Lake, CA.

One hundred years of fire suppression in the Sierra Nevada has resulted in forests full of dead wood and thickly clustered trees. This situation, plus continued urbanization of lands adjacent to national forest lands, has put the forests and homes at risk of catastrophic fire. A FEIS was released in October of 2006 addressing the situation in the Kings River Project area that applied an uneven aged silvicultural system and prescribed fire upon eight

units totaling 13,700 acres. On December 20, 2006 the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Kings River Project was signed. The decision was appealed and upheld by the Regional Forester. In May of 2007 a lawsuit was filed against the Forest Service that alleged the analysis conducted for the Kings River Project FEIS and ROD was inadequate. Since that time additional information has developed to help analyze effects of restoration projects on sensitive wildlife species like Pacific fisher. A new multi-forest Land Management Plan Amendment has also been issued regarding management indicator species. A new paper suggesting *An Ecosystem Management Strategy for Southern Sierra Mixed-Conifer Forests* by North, M., P. Stine, K. O'Hara, W. Zielinski and S. Stephens is about to be peer reviewed and published. Collaborative efforts with those who opposed this project and/or new information could change the timing, description, and location of activities within the project area that would require supplementing the FEIS and publishing a new ROD. As a result of this, the December 20, 2006 ROD was withdrawn.

Purpose and Need for Action

This supplement is focused on new information and clarification, particularly related to Pacific fisher; a new multi-forest Land Management Plan Amendment regarding management indicator species; applicable suggestions in a new paper titled *An Ecosystem Management Strategy for Southern Sierra Mixed-Conifer Forests* by North, M., P. Stine, K. O'Hara, W. Zielinski and S. Stephens; and ongoing collaboration so the purpose and need for action remain the same as was described in the 2007 Kings River Project FEIS. "The underlying need for the proposed action is to restore historical pre-1850 forest conditions across a large landscape" (Kings River Project FEIS pg. 1-4).

Proposed Action

The proposed action and all alternatives are expected to remain the same as was described in the 2007 Kings River Project FEIS. Three alternatives were analyzed in the FEIS to address the Purpose and Need: (1) The Proposed Action—including commercial tree harvest & thinning, underburning, reforestation, plantation maintenance, fuels treatments, watershed restoration projects, and herbicide treatments to plantations and noxious weeds, (2) No Action and (3) Reduction in Harvest Tree Size—limiting the vegetation treatments to trees 30" diameter and