Funds (SAE), sets forth procedures and recordkeeping requirements for use by SAs in reporting and maintaining records of their needs and uses of SAE funds. The final rule, Food Distribution Program-Reduction of the Paperwork Burden (62 FR 53727, October 16, 1997), makes agreements between the U.S. Department of Agriculture (Department) and State agencies to operate food distribution programs ongoing, instead of annual, with amendments to be added at the request of the Department. The agreement, FCS-74, Federal-State Agreement, is contained in the information collections for part 235.

Estimate of Burden: The reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated at 6,950 burden hours. The recordkeeping burden is estimated at 13,961 burden hours, which is comprised of the maintenance of records to document usage of SAE funds. The increase in reporting burden hours is associated with an increase in the number of State agencies from 84 to 87. The substantial decrease in the recordkeeping burden hours is due to increased automation within State agencies and alternate State agencies.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 87

Average Number of Responses per Respondent: 213 responses.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 20,912 burden hours.

Dated: October 20, 1998.

## Samuel Chambers, Jr.,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 98-28985 Filed 10-28-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-30-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

#### **Forest Service**

El Luky Duk Placer Claim, Suction **Dredging; Nez Perce National Forest,** Idaho County, ID

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA. **ACTION:** Notice; intent to prepare environmental impact statement.

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) to analyze and disclose the environmental effects of dredging on the El Luky Duk placer claim on the South Fork Clearwater River. The claimant has proposed using four different dredges (an eight-inch, a sixinch, a five-inch, and a three-inch), one at a time, to remove possible gold deposits from the gravel and at bedrock in the South Fork Clearwater River. The proposal is to operate for two years between the first of July to the first week

in October. The El Luky Duk placer claim is located in portions of Sections 20, 21, 27 and 28, T29N, R7E, BPM. The suction dredging is proposed for a reach of the river in Section 27.

**DATES:** Written comments and suggestions should be received on or before November 30, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments and suggestions on the proposed action or requests for a map of the proposed action or to be placed on the project mailing list to Michael R. McGee, Acting District Ranger, Red River Ranger District, P.O. Box 416, Elk City, Idaho 83525.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jo Ellis, District Geologist, Red River Ranger District, P.O. Box 416, Elk City, Idaho 83525, phone (208) 842-2245. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed action is proposed pursuant to the 1872 Mining Law, the Organic Administration Act of 1897 and Forest Service mining regulations, Title 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 228, Subpart A. The United States mining laws at 30 U.S.C. 21-54 confer a statutory right to enter upon the public land to search for and remove certain minerals. The Forest Service has the responsibility to make sure that the activities are conducted so as to minimize adverse environmental impacts to National Forest System lands, 36 CFR, Part 228, Subpart A.

The proposal involves processing approximately 325 cubic yards of river gravel over a 150 foot section of the South Fork Clearwater River. A cross section approximately eight feet wide and six feet deep would be processed. The process involves utilizing high pressure water pumps driven by gasoline-powered motors which create suction in a flexible intake pipe. A mixture of streambed sediment and water is vacuumed into the intake pipe and passed over a sluice box mounted on a floating barge. Dense particles (including gold) are trapped in the sluice box. The remainder of the entrained material is discharged into the stream as tailings or spoils. A hole is created in the gravel so bedrock is exposed. Cracks in the bedrock are then cleaned with the suction. Large boulders or rootwads are moved by cables attached to a winch.

The Forest Service will consider a range of alternatives to the proposed action. One of these will be the "no action" alternative, in which the Plan of Operations would not be approved. Additional alternatives will examine varying intensity and duration of the proposed activities, including restrictions on the size of equipment

and length of seasonal operation, as well as respond to the issues and other resource values.

Public participation is an important part of the project, commencing with the initial scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7), which starts with publication of this notice and continues for the next 30 days. In addition, the public is encouraged to visit with Forest Service officials at any time during the analysis and prior to the decision. The Forest Service will be seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, and local agencies, the Nez Perce Tribe, and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in or affected by the proposed action.

Comments from the public and other agencies will be used in preparation of the draft EIS. The scoping process will be used to:

 Identify potential issues;
 Identify major issues to be analyzed in depth;

- 3. Éliminate minor issues or those which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental analysis, such as the Nez Perce National Forest Plan EIS:
- 4. Identify alternatives to the proposed action;
- 5. Identify potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternatives (i.e., direct, indirect, and cumulative effects).

While public participation in this analysis is welcome at any time, comments received within 30 days of the publication of this notice will be especially useful in the preparation of the draft EIS, which is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency and available for public review in January 1999. A 45-day comment period will follow publication of a Notice of Availability of the draft EIS in the Federal Register. The comments received will be analyzed and considered in preparation of a final EIS, which is expected to be filed in June 1999. A Record of Decision will be issued not less than 30 days after publication of a Notice of Availability of the final EIS in the **Federal Register**.

The Forest Service believes it is important at this early stage to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of draft EISs must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal in such a way 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.C. 519, 513, (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the

draft EIS stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final 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 in order that substantive comments and objections are available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final EIS. To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments should be as specific as possible. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing to procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Michael R. McGee is the responsible official for this environmental impact statement.

Dated: October 20, 1998.

#### Michael R. McGee,

Acting District Ranger, Red River Ranger District, Nez Perce National Forest. [FR Doc. 98–29027 Filed 10–28–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

#### **DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

# Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

### **Deposting of Stockyards**

Notice is hereby given that the livestock markets named herein, originally posted on the dates specified below as being subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), no longer come within the definition of a stockyard under the Act and are therefore no longer subject to the provisions of the  $\Delta ct$ 

	Facility No., name, and location of stockyard	Date of posting
KY-126	Ranburne Stockyard, Ranburne, Alabama Heart of Illinois Arena, Peoria, Illinois Blue Grass Stockyards, Inc., Lexington, Kentucky Kentucky Livestock Exchange, Louisville, Kentucky Boone Stockyard, Inc., Boone, North Carolina	June 22, 1986. February 26, 1931. November 1, 1921

This notice is in the nature of a change relieving a restriction and, thus, may be made effective in less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** without prior notice or other public procedure. This notice is given pursuant to section 302 of the Packers and Stockyards Act (7 U.S.C. 202) and is effective upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Done at Washington, DC this 21st day of October 1998.

## Dr. Michael J. Caughlin, Jr.,

Director, Office of Policy Litigation/Support, Packers and Stockyards Programs.

[FR Doc. 98-28950 Filed 10-28-98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3410-EN P

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

# Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

## **Posting of Stockyards**

Pursuant to the authority provided under section 302 of the Packers and

Stockyards Act (7 U.S.C. 202), it was ascertained that the livestock markets named below were stockyards as defined by section 302(a). Notice was given to the stockyard owners and to the public as required by section 302(b) by posting notices at the stockyards on the dates specified below that the stockyards were subject to the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

	Facility No., name, and location of stockyard	Date of posting
NM-123 NC-173	Southwest Livestock Auction, Lo Lunas, New Mexico	August 12, 1998. September 16, 1998.

Done at Washington, DC this 22nd day of October 1998.

#### Dr. Michael J. Caughlin, Jr.,

Director, Office of Policy Litigation/Support, Packers and Stockyards Programs.

 $[FR\ Doc.\ 98-28949\ Filed\ 10-28-98;\ 8:45\ am]$ 

BILLING CODE 3410-EN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## Natural Resources Conservation Service

Notice of Proposed Change to the Natural Resources Conservation Service's National Handbook of Conservation Practices

AGENCY: Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), U.S. Department of Agriculture, New York State Office.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of proposed changes in the NRCS National Handbook of Conservation Practices,

Section IV of the New York State NRCS Field Office Technical Guide (FOTG) for review and comment.

**SUMMARY:** It is the intention of NRCS to issue a new conservation practice standard in its National Handbook of Conservation Practices. This new standard is: Water Testing (NY 731).

**DATES:** Comments will be received on or before November 30, 1998.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Inquire in writing to Richard D. Swenson, State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service, (NRCS), 441 S. Salina Street, Fifth Floor,