

conditions may result in the availability of additional types of commodities or the non-availability of one or more types listed above. Once USDA has made the commodities available to States, State officials will be responsible for determining how to allocate the State's "fair share" to eligible organizations. States have full discretion in determining the amount of commodities that will be made available to organizations for distribution to needy households for use in home-prepared meals or for providing prepared meals to the needy at congregate feeding sites. In accordance with section 871 of the Personal Responsibility Act, which amended section 202A of the EFAA, the Department does, however, encourage States to establish a State advisory board comprised of public and private entities with an interest in the distribution of TEFAP commodities. Such advisory boards can provide valuable input on how commodities should be allocated among various eligible outlet types, what areas have the greatest need for food assistance, and other important issues that will help States to use their resources in the most efficient and effective manner possible.

In section 110 of the Hunger Prevention Act, Congress established the Soup Kitchens/Food Banks Program. Under the provisions of section 110, the Secretary was required to purchase and distribute commodities to States for use by soup kitchens and food banks. Section 873 of the Personal Responsibility Act deletes section 110 of the Hunger Prevention Act and provides for the absorption of the Soup Kitchens/Food Banks Program into TEFAP. Therefore, commodities will not be purchased for distribution under the Soup Kitchens/Food Banks Program in FY 1997. Organizations that had been eligible for SK/FB will, however, be eligible to receive commodities under the expanded TEFAP.

Dated: January 13, 1997.

William E. Ludwig,  
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97-1432 Filed 1-21-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-30-U

## Forest Service

### Permitting Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC) Huts and Pinkham Notch Visitor Center (PNVC) in the White Mountain National Forest

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

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

#### SUMMARY:

**Proposed Federal Action.**—The proposed Federal action is to authorize AMC under a 30-year term special use permit (38 Stat., 11.01, as amended) to continue to occupy National Forest System (NFS) land in order to operate, maintain, and reconstruct its facilities to provide public recreation and information services as defined in the White Mountain National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) and to provide other services as outlined in the AMC's Master Development Plan (MDP), consistent with the White Mountain National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) and Special Use Permit Authority.

Based on Forest Plan goals, the primary purposes of the Huts and Pinkham Notch Visitor Center (PNVC) are to provide recreation opportunities and information services. Other uses proposed in AMC's master plan are not essential to these two purposes; however, they are not in conflict. Therefore, uses at the huts within the proposed action include: Food and lodging (seasonally); information services; education programs; support for research, trails, and search and rescue; and retail sales. Uses at PNVC include: Food and lodging; visitor information services; educational programs; administration of programs; public meeting space; a support center for search and rescue; employee housing; visitor center store; and other public facilities (parking, showers). The specific activities within the authorized uses will be reviewed through the annual Operating Plan, and subject to environmental review as necessary. For example, we propose to authorize Pinkham Notch Visitor Center as an administrative center for research. Specific research proposals will be addressed on a case by case basis.

The facilities on National Forest System lands are Pinkham Notch Visitor Center, Greenleaf Hut, Galehead Hut, Zealand Hut, Mizpah Hut, Lakes of the Clouds Hut, Carter Notch Hut, and the area around Madison Spring Hut (the Hut itself is on one acre of private land). There is no proposed change to the overnight capacity at PNVC or the Huts. There are also no proposed changes to the facilities, except for the reconstruction of Galehead Hut and the PNVC parking lot.

The proposal to reconstruct Galehead Hut includes adding 430 square feet to the existing footprint and rotating the Hut southward 33 degrees. In addition, the septic system (gray water and grease trap) would be moved to the north of the Hut away from the

viewshed of the Pemigewasset Wilderness.

The proposed redesign and reconstruction of the parking lot at PNVC will occur within the existing footprint. The proposal includes: Paving and marking the lot to maximize utilization of available parking space; improving vegetation barriers between the lot and highway; parking and access for persons with disabilities; a minimum 3-foot grass perimeter for snow loading and filtering runoff; and recycling pavement where removed. The existing parking lot lighting will be retained.

This proposed action includes monitoring impacts of solid and sanitary waste disposal on water quality, and the effects of soil compaction on surrounding vegetation within the permitted area of the huts.

**Responsible Official.**—The responsible official is Donna Hepp, Forest Supervisor, White Mountain National Forest, 719 Main Street, Laconia, New Hampshire.

**Decision to be Made.**—The decision is whether or not to authorize AMC under a 30 year term special use permit to continue to occupy National Forest System (NFS) land in order to operate, maintain, and reconstruct its facilities to provide public recreation and information services as defined in the White Mountain National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) and to provide other services as outlined in the AMC's MDP, consistent with the White Mountain National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) and Special Use Permit Authority. The decision includes the Forest Supervisor's approval of site specific mitigation and/or monitoring requirements.

**Issuing authority.**—The issuing authority will be a term special use permit under the Term Permit Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat., 11.01, as amended). The length of permit depends on the level of investment on National Forest System lands. The value of PNVC and the Huts indicates a term of 30 years.

**Alternatives.**—In preparing the environmental impact statement the Forest Service will consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed action, including a "no action" alternative. The no action alternative will be the continuation of operations under the terms and conditions of the permit issued to the AMC in 1965, as amended up through October 29, 1995. The no action alternative is the baseline against which the effects of other alternatives are

compared, and represents the present course until the action is changed.

Response to AMC's proposed Master Development Plan demonstrated interest by some people to consider removal of the huts from the alpine zone. This, as well as other alternatives based on public comment, may be analyzed. Suggestions on alternatives that meet the purpose and need for action are welcome.

**Issues**—Tentative physical, biological and socio-economic issues that have been identified related specifically to the AMC Hut and PNVC proposal are: (1) Impacts on the alpine zone; (2) impacts on Threatened and Endangered (T&E) species; (3) impacts on native plants and animals; (4) impacts on water resources; (5) impacts on soil; (6) impacts on the quality of the recreation experience; (7) impacts on the amount of recreation use at the Huts and PNVC; (8) maintenance of recreation opportunities represented by these facilities as part of the implementation of the Forest Plan; (9) impacts on the visual resource; (10) impacts on Wilderness; (11) impacts on Appalachian Trail users; (12) impacts on the quality of life in local communities and (13) impacts on the economy. Other comments were received during the review of the Master Development Plan. Many comments related to administration of the permit, concerns about community relations, advocacy, etc. Since these are not environmental issues they will not be resolved in the EIS. They will be considered through permit administration and other measures.

**Assisting Agencies**—The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development, Natural Heritage Inventory and New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game have been asked to provide assistance.

**For further information**—Direct questions about the proposed action and environmental impact statement to AMC Permit Project Coordinator, White Mountain National Forest, 719 Main Street, Laconia, New Hampshire 03246, ATT: R. Oreskes, or phone Rebecca Oreskes at 603-466-2713 Ext 212.

**SCOPING:** The initial scoping period begins January 21, 1997 and ends March 7, 1997. The DEIS is expected to be completed in the fall of 1997.

The Forest Service is inviting written comments and suggestions on the scope of the analysis. A scoping letter will be sent to interested and affected individuals and organizations. In

addition, the agency gives notice of the full environmental analysis and decision-making process that will occur on the proposal so interested and affected people are aware of how they may participate and contribute to the final decision.

Public participation has been and will continue to be important throughout this process. Before this official scoping began the Forest Service asked for comment on AMC's proposed Master Development Plan. The Forest held three public listening sessions and received several thousand comments, letters, cards and phone calls on AMC's operation in the Forest. These comments are still valid and will be used in the scoping process and environmental analysis.

All the input received to date as well as the input from this scoping will be used as part of the formal scoping process which 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 (i.e., direct, indirect, and cumulative effects).
6. Determining potential cooperating agencies and task assignments.

Submit additional written comments and suggestions concerning the scope of the analysis to AMC Permit Team, White Mountain National Forest, 719 Main St., Laconia, New Hampshire 03246. Comments beyond those already on hand must be received by March 7, 1997.

The second stage of formal public involvement is on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The DEIS is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review in Fall 1997. At that time EPA will publish a notice of availability of the DEIS in the Federal Register. The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 60 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency's notice of availability appears in the Federal Register.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The White Mountain National Forest will begin the process of Forest Plan revision in 1997 and plans to issue a Notice of Intent in 1998. To date we believe three Forest Plan level issues have been raised in the context of the AMC permit. We will

carefully separate those comments applicable to the Forest Plan revision from those in the site specific analysis. These three issues are: (1) Appalachian Trail management, (2) the types of recreation use on public lands and (3) the intensity of recreation use on the Forest.

#### Appalachian Trail Management

PNVC and some of the Huts predate the Appalachian Trail and the Appalachian Trail was routed to take advantage of these existing facilities. There are two types of issues relating to the Appalachian Trail: (1) Forest Plan Standards and Guides and (2) the site specific effects on Appalachian Trail users. We will not address the first issue in this analysis since it relates to a larger Management Area issue than just the AMC Huts; nothing in the AMC Hut or PNVC permitting analysis will compromise the ability to resolve the greater Appalachian Trail/Forest Plan Standards and Guides issue. We will address the site specific Appalachian Trail experience in the EIS.

#### Types of Recreation Use on Public Lands

The current Forest Plan defines a mix of recreation uses. Neither our monitoring nor public comment has shown user conflicts relevant to the AMC permits that cannot be resolved on a site specific basis.

#### Intensity of Recreation Use

This concerns the level of recreation use on the Forest. This is a Forest-wide issue and will continue to be addressed in Forest planning. There are specific aspects of this issue which we will look at in this analysis. We will analyze the site specific direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the Huts and PNVC and major access trails in the EIS.

In all cases the Land and Resource Management Plan takes primacy over special use permits. Changes in the Forest Land and Resource Management Plan may lead to changes to special use permits.

#### Importance of Timely Response

The Forest Service believes that, 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 proposal 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, 553 (1978). Also,

environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental impact stage that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement 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 responding to the DEIS 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 environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering 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 statements. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated or 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.

After the comment period ends on the DEIS, the comments will be analyzed and considered by the Forest Service in preparing the final environmental impact statement (FEIS). The FEIS is scheduled to be completed by the Fall of 1997. In the FEIS the Forest Service is required to respond to the comments received (40 CFR 1503.4). The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, environmental consequences discussed in the FEIS, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making a decision regarding this proposal. The responsible official will document the decision and reasons for the decision in the Record of Decision. The decision will be subject to appeal under 36 CFR part 217 and 36 CFR part 251.

Dated: January 14, 1997.

Donna Hepp,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 97-1476 Filed 1-21-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

DOC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

*Agency:* Bureau of the Census.

*Title:* Business and Professional Classification Report.

*Form Number(s):* B-625(97).

*Agency Approval Number:* 0607-0189.

*Type of Request:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Burden:* 9,101 hours.

*Number of Respondents:* 42,000.

*Average Hours Per Response:* 13 minutes.

*Needs and Uses:* The Bureau of the Census conducts the Business and Professional Classification Report to collect sales and other information from a sample redrawn every quarter of retail, wholesale, service, and unclassified business recently assigned Federal Employer Identification numbers (EIN). We are informed of the existence of these new businesses from lists provided by the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration. From the information we collect in this survey, we determine an appropriate measure of size, company organization and establishment information, taxable or tax-exempt status, wholesale inventories, type of operation, and assign a new or more refined kind-of-business classification. We use this information to include these businesses in our retail, wholesale, and service surveys. This keeps the sampling frames for our current business surveys up-to-date with the business universe. We plan to make the necessary revisions to the B-625 form to enable us to assign kind-of-business codes based on the new North American Industry Classification Systems (NAICS) in addition to the existing Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system.

*Affected Public:* Business or other for-profit organizations, Not-for-profit institutions.

*Frequency:* One time only per respondent.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Voluntary.

*Legal Authority:* Title, 13 U.S.C., Section 182.

*OMB Desk Officer:* Jerry Coffey, (202) 395-7314.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier,

Acting DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482-3271, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the information collection proposal should be sent within 30 days of publication to this notice to Jerry Coffey, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10201, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Dated: January 14, 1997.

Linda Engelmeier,

Acting Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 97-1525 Filed 1-21-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-F

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

DOC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

*Agency:* Patent and Trademark Office (PTO).

*Title:* Patent Cooperation Treaty.

*Agency Form Number:* PCT/RO/101 and Annex 134/144; PCT/IPEA/401 and Annex PCT/1B/328; PCT/Model Power of Attorney; Model of General Power of Attorney.

*OMB Approval Number:* 0651-0021.

*Type of Request:* Reinstatement of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired.

*Burden:* 98,195 hours.

*Number of Respondents:* 15,800 (102,950 submissions per year).

*Avg. Hours Per Response:* Varies between .25 and 4 hours depending on the requirement.

*Needs and Uses:* The information collected is required by the Patent Cooperation Treaty. The general purpose of the Treaty is to simplify the filing of patent applications on the same invention in different countries. It provides for a centralized filing procedure and a standardized application format.

*Affected Public:* Individuals, businesses or other for-profit organizations, not-for profit institutions, farms, federal, state, local or tribal governments.

*Frequency:* On occasion.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

*OMB Desk Officer:* Maya A. Bernstein, (202) 395-3785.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by