

*Need and Use of the Information:* The information is used by RHS to determine whether a loan/grant can be approved, to ensure that RHS had adequate security for the loans financed and to provide for sound construction and development work.

*Description of Respondents:* Individuals and households; business or other for-profit; not-for-profit institutions; farms.

*Number of Respondents:* 23,223.

*Frequency of Responses:*

Recordkeeping; Reporting: On occasion.

*Total Burden Hours:* 111,882.

#### • Food and Consumer Service

*Title:* School Nutrition Study.

*OMB Control Number:* 0584-New.

*Summary:* This proposed study is designed to examine meals offered by and characteristics of school nutrition programs. Data will be collected from a nationally representative sample of public elementary, middle and high schools during the fall of the 1997-98 school year.

*Need and Use of the Information:* The data collection and analysis will provide USDA with an up-to-date assessment of the progress of the nation's schools implementing the *Dietary Guidelines and Recommended Daily Allowances* in school meats.

*Description of Respondents:* State, Local, or Tribal Government.

*Number of Respondents:* 1,581.

*Frequency of Responses:* Reporting: One-time only.

*Total Burden Hours:* 9,482.

**Donald Hulcher,**

*Deputy Departmental Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 97-7806 Filed 3-26-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-01-M

#### Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. 97-022-1]

#### Intent to Issue Veterinary Biological Product Licenses

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** We are advising the public that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service intends to issue veterinary biological product licenses to Rhone Merieux, Inc., for four veterinary vaccines intended for use in dogs. This proposed action is consistent with the conclusions of a risk analysis that formed the basis of an environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact prepared prior to the authorization of field trials for those

vaccines. With this notice, we are stating our intention to issue veterinary biological product licenses for those vaccines after 14 days from the date of this notice unless new substantial issues bearing on the effects of the action contemplated here are brought to our attention.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact prepared for the field testing of the products may be obtained by writing to the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. Please refer to the docket number of this notice when requesting copies. Copies of the environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact (as well as the risk analysis with confidential business information removed) 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 those documents are requested to call ahead on (202) 690-2817 to facilitate entry into the reading room.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Jeanette Greenberg, Technical Writer-Editor, Center for Veterinary Biologics-Licensing and Policy Development, VS, APHIS, USDA, 4700 River Road Unit 148, Riverdale, MD 20737-1231; telephone (301) 734-5338; fax (301) 734-8910.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** We are advising the public that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) intends to issue veterinary biological product licenses to Rhone Merieux, Inc., Establishment License No. 298, for four veterinary vaccines intended for use in dogs. These vaccines each contain a canarypox-vectored canine distemper fraction. The true names and product codes of the four vaccines are as follows:

(1) Canine Distemper-Adenovirus Type 2-Coronavirus-Parainfluenza-Parvovirus Vaccine, Modified Live Virus, Canarypox Vector, Leptospira Bacterin (Code 46J9.R1);

(2) Canine Distemper-Adenovirus Type 2-Parainfluenza-Parvovirus Vaccine, Modified Live Virus, Canarypox Vector, Leptospira Bacterin (Code 4639.R1);

(3) Canine Distemper-Adenovirus Type 2-Coronavirus-Parainfluenza-Parvovirus Vaccine, Modified Live Virus, Canarypox Vector (Code 1591.R1); and

(4) Canine Distemper-Adenovirus Type 2-Parainfluenza-Parvovirus Vaccine, Modified Live Virus, Canarypox Vector (Code 13D1.R1).

The products numbered (1) and (3) above were field tested directly. The products numbered (2) and (4) above contain the same components as (1) and (3), respectively, except that they lack the Canine Coronavirus fraction; therefore, they are being licensed based on data generated for the products numbered (1) and (3).

With this notice, APHIS states its intention to issue veterinary biological product licenses for these products after 14 days from the date of this notice unless new substantial issues, bearing on the effects of the action contemplated here, are brought to APHIS' attention.

This proposed action is consistent with the conclusions of a risk analysis, which formed the basis for the environmental assessment (EA) supporting authorization of a field trial using these vaccines. Since the issues raised by authorization of a field trial and by issuance of a product license are identical, and since the field trial data have supported the conclusions of the original EA and finding of no significant impact (FONSI), APHIS has concluded that the EA and FONSI generated for the field trial are also applicable to the proposed licensing actions. Therefore, APHIS does not intend to issue a separate EA to support issuance of product licenses. Based on our original FONSI, reconfirmed here, we have determined that an environmental impact statement need not be prepared.

**Authority:** 21 U.S.C. 151-159.

Done in Washington, DC, this 21st day of March 1997.

**Donald W. Luchsinger,**

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

[FR Doc. 97-7809 Filed 3-26-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

#### Forest Service

#### Changes in Mammoth Creek Minimum Streamflow Requirements and Point of Measurement, and Changes in Place of Use

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

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

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the proposed amendment to the existing Master Operating Agreement establishing minimum streamflow requirements for Mammoth Creek, and Point of Measurement. The Forest Service, Inyo National Forest, Mono County, California, is acting as joint lead agency on the project, together with the

Mammoth Community Water District (District). Under the California Environmental Quality Act, the District must conduct its own environmental assessment, and has determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required. In accordance with Federal and State regulations, a joint EIR/RIS will be prepared. The agency gives notice of the environmental analysis and decision making processes that will occur on the proposal so that interested and affected people are aware of how they may participate and contribute to the final decision.

**DATES:** Comments regarding the scope of the analysis must be received by April 30, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit written comments and suggestions concerning the proposed action to the responsible official, Dennis Martin, Forest Supervisor, Inyo National Forest, 873 North Main Street, Bishop, California 93154, Attn. MCWD EIR/EIS.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Direct questions about this environmental impact statement to Thom Heller, Special Use Permit Administrator, Inyo National Forest, P.O. Box 148, Mammoth Lakes, California 93546, or telephone (619) 924-5513.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The proposed action consists of two specific components: 1) a change in the minimum streamflow requirements for Mammoth Creek and the point of measurement, and 2) a change in the District's authorized Place of Use (POU) for Mammoth Creek water. The change in minimum streamflow requirements and point of measurement result in both state and federal actions that require CEQA and NEPA documentation. Although addressed in the joint EIR/EIS, the change in the POU is a state action only, and not subject to NEPA. Three alternatives are currently being considered: changing the minimum streamflow requirements to the schedule shown on Table 2 (Proposed action); changing the minimum streamflow requirements to an alternative, three-flow schedule; and not changing the minimum streamflow requirements (no action).

Public participation will be specially important at several points during the analysis. The first point is the scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7). The Forest Service has and is seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, and local agencies and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in or affected by the proposed action. This input will be used

in preparation of the draft EIR/EIS. The scoping process includes:

1. Identifying potential issues.
2. Identifying issues to be analyzed in depth
3. Eliminating insignificant issues or those which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental analysis.
4. Exploring additional alternatives.
5. Identifying potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternatives (e.g., direct, indirect, and cumulative effects and connected actions).
6. Determining potential cooperating agencies and task assignments.

Mailings to individuals and agencies that participate in the above planning efforts will provide them with information about the proposed project. Public meetings, if held, will be announced locally. Federal, State, and local agencies, user groups and other organizations who would be interested in the study will be invited to participate in scoping the issues that should be considered.

The draft EIR/EIS is scheduled to be completed by September, 1997. The comment period on this draft EIR/EIS will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency's notice of availability appears in the **Federal Register**. It is very important that those interested in the proposed action participate at that time.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewers notice 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 proposed action so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft EIR/EIS stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final EIR/EIS may be waived 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 this 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 meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final EIR/EIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft EIR/EIS should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft document. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft EIR/EIS or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the document. 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.

After the comment period ends on the draft EIR/EIS, the comments will be analyzed and considered by the Forest Service in preparing the final EIR/EIS, which is expected to be completed by December, 1997. The Forest Service is required to respond in the final EIS to the comments received (40 CFR 1503.4). The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, and environmental consequences discussed in the final EIS and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making his decision on the proposal.

The decision will either be approval of the proposed action as submitted, approval of the proposed action as modified, or denial of the proposed action (No. Action). If the proposal is approved, the existing Memorandum of Agreement would be modified and the revised minimum flow requirements for Mammoth Creek would be approved. The responsible official will document the decision and rationale in the Record of Decision. The decision will be subject to appeal under 36 CFR 215 or regulations applicable at the time of the decision.

Dated: March 21, 1997.

**Dennis W. Martin,**  
Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 97-7773 Filed 3-26-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

### **Southwest Oregon Provincial Interagency Executive Committee (PIEC), Advisory Committee**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Southwest Oregon PIEC Advisory Committee will meet on April 17, 1997 at the J. Herbert Stone Nursery, 2606 Old Stage Road, Central Point, Oregon. The meeting will begin at 9:00 a.m. and continue until 4:30 p.m. Agenda items to be covered include: (1) Update on coarse woody material standard implementation; (2) COHO