

After the comment period ends on the DEIS, comments will be analyzed, considered, and responded by the Forest Service in preparing the Final EIS. The FEIS, is scheduled to be completed in December of 2001. The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, environmental consequences discussed in the FEIS, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making decisions regarding the revision. The responsible official will document the decisions and reasons for the decisions in a Record of Decision for the revised Plan. The decision will be subject to appeal in accordance with 36 CFR Part 217.

Dated: September 23, 1999.

**Tom L. Thompson,**

*Acting Regional Forester, Rocky Mountain Region.*

[FR Doc. 99-26175 Filed 10-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### **Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Comanche and Cimarron National Grasslands, Headquartered in Pueblo, CO**

**AGENCY:** USDA, Forest Service.

**ACTION:** Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in conjunction with revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan for the Pike and San Isabel National Forests, and the Comanche and Cimarron National Grasslands (PSICC), located in Clear Creek, Douglas, Jefferson, EL Paso, Teller, Park, Summit, Lake, Chafee, Saguache, Fremont, Custer, Huerfano, Costilla, Pueblo, Las Animas, Otero, and Baca counties in Colorado, and Morton and Stevens counties in Kansas.

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Service will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in conjunction with the revision of its Land and Resource Management Plan (hereafter referred to as the Plan) for the Pike and San Isabel National Forests, and the Comanche and Cimarron National Grasslands, (hereafter referred to as PSICC).

This notice describes the proposed action, specific portions of the current Plan to be revised, environmental issues considered in the revision, estimated dates for filing the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), information concerning public participation, and the names and addresses of the agency officials who can provide additional information.

**DATES:** The Public is asked to provide comments identifying and considering issues, concerns, and the scope of the analysis with regard to the proposed action, in writing by January 31, 2000. The Forest Service proposes to file a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and make it available for public comment in the spring of 2001. The Forest Service proposes to file a Final Plan and EIS that will be available in the fall of 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Hill, Planning Staff Officer, (719) 545-8737. Please send written comments on this Notice of Intent to: Donnie R. Sparks, Acting Forest Supervisor, PSICC, 1920 Valley Drive, Pueblo, CO 81008-1797.

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:** Lyle Laverty, Rocky Mountain Regional Forester at P.O. Box 25127, Lakewood, CO 80225-0127.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to Part 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 219.10(g), the Regional Forester for the Rocky Mountain Region gives notice of the agency's intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for the revision effort described above. According to 36 CFR 216.10(g), land and resource management plans are ordinarily revised on a 10 to 15 year cycle. The existing Forest Plan was approved on September, 1984. This Plan has been amended 25 times including two major amendments related to the December 1991 Oil and Gas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the 1993 Colorado Wilderness bill.

The Regional Forester gives notice that the Forest is beginning an environmental analysis and decision-making process for this proposed action so that interested or affected people can participate in the analysis and contribute to the final decision.

Opportunities will be provided to discuss the Forest Plan revision process openly with the public. The public is invited to help identify issues and define the range of alternatives to be considered in the environmental impact statement. Forest Service officials will lead these discussions, helping to describe issues and the preliminary alternatives. These officials will also explain the environmental analysis process and the disclosures of that analysis, which will be available for public review. Written comments identifying issues for analysis and the range of alternatives are encouraged to be submitted to PSICC by January 21, 2000. A regular schedule of public meetings will be in the summer of 2000. Alternative development meetings will

be held in winter of 2000. Public notice of dates, times, and locations for specific meetings will be provided in local newspapers and posted on the Forest's web site: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/psicc>. Additionally, we will send notices and newsletters to those on the forest plan revision mailing list. Requests to be placed on this mailing list should be sent to the comment address stated above.

Two Plans will be written in accordance with National direction from Mike Dombeck, Chief of the Forest Service. One will describe the intended management of the Pike and San Isabel National Forests; the other will describe the intended management of the Comanche and Cimarron National Grasslands.

The United States has a unique legal relationship with Indian tribal governments as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, treaties, statutes, Executive orders, and court decisions. As part of the overall effort to uphold the federal trust responsibilities to tribal sovereign nations to the extent applicable to National Forest System lands, the Forest Service will establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with the tribal nations on a government-to-government basis. The Forest Service will work with governments to address issues concerning Indian tribal self-government and sovereignty, natural and cultural resources held in trust, Indian tribal treaty and Executive order rights, and any issues that significantly or uniquely affect their communities.

Forest Plans make six fundamental decisions.<sup>1</sup> These decisions are:

1. Establishment of forest-wide multiple-use goals and objectives, (36 CFR 219.11(b)).

2. Establishment of forestwide management requirements (standards and guidelines) to fulfill the requirements of the NFMA relating to future activities (resource integration requirements of 36 CFR 219.13 to 219.27).

3. Establishing of management area direction (management area prescriptions) applying to future management activities in that management area (36 CFR 219.11).

4. Designation of land suitable for timber production and the establishment of allowable timber sale quality (36 CFR 219.14 and 219.16).

5. Nonwilderness multiple-use allocations for those roadless areas that were reviewed under 36 CFR 219.17 and

<sup>1</sup> *Citizens for Environmental Quality v. U.S.* 731 F. Supp. 977 (D.Colo. 1989).

not recommended for wilderness designation.

6. Monitoring and evaluation requirements (36 CFR 219.11(d)).

The authorization of project-level activities on PSICC occurs through project decision-making, which is the second stage of land management planning, called Plan implementation. Project planning and decision making is an on-going process that occurs on all eight Ranger Districts and Supervisor's office before, during and after Plan revision. Project level decisions must also comply with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) procedures and must include a determination that the project is consistent with the Plan. The current Plan remains in effect and must be complied with until the revised Plan is completed and approved.

### Synopsis on the Current Plan

The current Plan emerged from a zero-based planning process that considered alternative management emphases within an overall context of multiple use. The planning process recognized the concept of biodiversity and incorporated various aspects of it into the Plan. The selected alternative—and the basis for management of PSICC's lands in ensuing years—established PSICC as a unit where recreation and wildlife (including TES species) play a key role, while production of commodities such as timber is maintained at moderate levels. PSICC's proximity is growing metropolitan area accounts for the recreation component, while the unit's vast geographic reach spans a wide range of ecosystems and habitats and accounts for the wildlife component.

The current Plan adopted a mid-range level of timber harvest and projected that activities thereunder would play a central role in addressing the needs of wildlife habitat, forest health, and fuels accumulation. Soon after the Plan was approved, however, structural changes occurred affecting both the local timber industry and the regulatory environment for conducting timber harvest. The result was a PSICC timber harvest program that performed at much lower levels than projected during the planning process.

### Framework for Future Planning

Since the current Plan was approved in 1984, the biodiversity concept it embraced has evolved somewhat into an approach that seeks better recognition and integration of ecosystem components. Ecosystems management and sustainability have replaced multiple use and sustained yield. As a

reflection of this, the Forest Service has adopted a Natural Resource Agenda for the 21st Century, which will be the foundation for future National Forest management and includes ecosystem sustainability. The agenda has four key areas:

1. Watershed health and restoration.
2. Sustainable forest ecosystem management.
3. Forest roads.
4. Recreation.

Other developments include the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) which was passed in 1993. This act directs the preparation of periodic strategic plans by federal agencies. The first strategic plan for the Forest Service was written in 1997 and centers around the following three goals:

1. Ensure sustainable ecosystems.
2. Provide multiple benefits for people within the capabilities of ecosystems.
3. Ensure organizational effectiveness.

Ecosystem management, the Natural Resource Agenda for the 21st Century, and the GPRA Strategic Plan focus on outcomes and desired resource conditions rather than outputs of goods and services. These need to be incorporated into the revised Forest Plan.

### Need for Changes in the Current Plan

In addition to the regulatory requirement to revise Forest Plans every 10 to 15 years and the new framework for future planning described above, PSICC's experience in implementing the current plan and monitoring its effects shows a need for certain changes. Several other sources have also highlighted the need for changes in the current Plan. These sources include the following:

1. Public involvement, for individual projects and amendments to the Plan, which has identified new information, public values and an indication of the Plan's overall palatability.
2. Monitoring and scientific research which has provided a better understanding of ecosystems structure, function and health.
3. Forest plan implementation which has identified management concerns to find better ways for accomplishing desired conditions.

4. Technology improvements allowing better data collection and analysis.

### Proposed Action

Based on these sources of information, various aspects of the Plan have been identified as possibly needing change. These aspects range from the broad to the specific. The key broad

aspect to be examined regards whether the current Plan adequately addresses the relationship between the impacts of recreation uses and the habitat needs of threatened, endangered and sensitive species. Since the current Plan was approved, changes have occurred both in specie lists in these categories and in ways of thinking about habitats in terms of ecosystem management and sustainability. In addition, recreation patterns have changed: more people are visiting and their means of enjoyment have evolved. A look needs to be taken at the interaction of recreation patterns and habitat needs to determine whether and how the current Plan might be changed to maintain a fair balance between these distinctly different uses of National Forest.

A variety of more specific changes also appear to be in order. Additional wildernesses have been designated, but management area direction for them has not been cleanly incorporated into the Plan. In addition, many standards and guidelines redundantly state direction found in law, regulation and policy that must be followed in any case; these are to be removed. Other standards and guidelines may be revised to reflect improved scientific or regulatory understanding. Further, the current Plan's labeling of management areas will be changed to reflect a scheme adopted by several Forest Service Regions to achieve better consistency of terms among Plans.

Overall, the types of changes to be considered are seen as being largely fine-tuning in nature. That is, public response and agency experience under the current Plan do not appear to be demanding a repeat of the zero-based planning process such as was conducted while developing the current plan. Those aspects of the current Plan that have proven to be good policy do not need to be changed. Accordingly, the revision process is expected to concentrate on improving the current Plan rather than exploring entirely different ways of managing PSICC's lands. Among other things this approach will better focus on the interests of PSICC's users while keeping planning costs within the unit's financial means.

### Major Revision Issues

Based on the experience and information sources identified above, revision is being initiated to meet legal requirements, and to address all needed changes in the Plan. In order to focus and streamline revision efforts, two *major* issues have been identified. These two major issues will require major changes in Plan, and their inter-

relationship will be the primary drivers of the analysis and the range of alternatives in the revision process. Both issues are complex; together they affect every acre of land and every resource program on the PSICC.

### *1. Biodiversity and Ecological Sustainability*

#### *Planning Questions*

- How will the PSICC Plan be changed to maintain or improve biological diversity (biodiversity) and provide sufficient habitat for the long-term viability for populations of focal species, especially for Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive (TES) Species?
- How will recreation and natural resource management program direction on the PSICC need to change to ensure healthy sustainable ecosystems?

#### *Background*

Biological diversity (biodiversity) is the full variety of life in an area including the ecosystems, plant and animal communities, species and genes, and the processes through which organisms interact with one another and their environment. Humans and human activity are integral parts of ecosystems and will be considered in the analysis. On the PSICC, biodiversity may have been reduced from its 1984 level because of increased human activity and the suppression of fires.

The current Plan partially addresses the concept of biodiversity. In revision, biodiversity concepts will be used for revising management strategies for the physical, biological and social environment. An integrated analysis will incorporate the best currently available information and technology, and will include information from any range of natural variability assessments prepared for the Region. The Forest Service believes biodiversity could decrease under continued implementation of the existing PSICC Plan. The revision will review specific methods for management of biodiversity and provide for monitoring of management actions to measure progress and ensure ecological sustainability through adaptive management.

Of significant concern to the Forest Service is the biological condition of forest and rangeland vegetation. The Forest Service believes it will be necessary to use prescribed fire and some timber harvest to begin to restore a healthy vegetation condition. Others believe the best way to restore this condition is to minimize human intervention and to allow natural

processes to restore diversity. These options will be weighed during the revision process.

Related topics include:

- How to restore fire to the ecosystem and engage in vegetation treatment in the urban/wildland interface;
- How to maintain sustainable rangeland health and protect TES species with a balance between domestic grazing and wildlife use;
- How can cost-effective levels of grazing be maintained so ranching can continue to be an element in local community character;
- How to maintain critical wildlife habitat and viable populations of important species on public lands; and
- How to maintain water and air quality while continuing multiple-use management.

### *2. Roadless Area Management*

#### *Planning Questions*

- Which roadless areas on the PSICC qualify for Wilderness and should be recommended for designation to the National Wilderness system?
- How should roadless and unroaded areas not recommended for Wilderness be managed to meet current and expected demands for motorized and non-motorized recreation, and other resource management access needs?

#### *Background*

The Forest Service is required (36 CFR 219.17) to evaluate all roadless areas for potential Wilderness designation during the revision process. This process will produce an inventory of roadless areas meeting minimum criteria for Wilderness according to the 1964 Wilderness Act. Wilderness designation is a Congressional responsibility, so the Forest Service will only make recommendations.

The PSICC has significant amounts of land which are roadless or unroaded (containing no "classified" or system roads), because of the steep terrain in many areas. All of the unroaded areas on the PSICC (except designated Wilderness areas) will be inventoried for roadless area potential. There has been relatively little development and moderate evidence of human use in roadless areas on the PSICC since 1984. Recommendations for Wilderness designation will be made for those inventoried areas which meet the criteria and which the Regional Forester believes should be added to the National Wilderness System.

The management of roadless and unroaded areas not recommended for Wilderness will be reviewed during the revision process. Both motorized and

non-motorized recreationists want to maintain or improve their access and travel opportunities on the PSICC. Some of the roadless and unroaded areas are currently managed for summer and/or winter motorized trail or area use. Traditional forms of recreation such as driving for pleasure, hiking, horseback riding, and snowmobiling are showing steady increases. Mountain biking, cross-country skiing, all-terrain vehicle use, rafting, and kayaking have grown dramatically in the past decade.

The PSICC is one of the top units in the nation for recreation opportunities and use, with over 3 million people living within an hour of the national forests and grasslands. Because of the high levels of current and historic recreation and other use, the PSICC has been implementing travel management for the past 20+ years. Travel management is the movement of people, goods, and services to and through the Forest. Travel management is an ongoing process, and there is always more to be done to improve it. Most of the PSICC is currently under management that shows on maps and on the ground where people and vehicles can and can not go. All of the Pike and San Isabel National Forest lands require that wheeled vehicles stay on designated roads and trails, with no off road or off trail travel except for snowmobiles operating over snow. The Comanche and Cimarron Grasslands expect to complete their travel management to the same quality standard by about 2001. This will be accomplished through District project planning, not through Plan revision.

Recreation on the PSICC has a significant economic impact locally and in the state of Colorado. Concerns exist about the effects of high recreation use on the physical and biological environment. Rapidly increasing summer and winter recreation is creating a need to address the separation of motorized and non-motorized users in some areas. Changes needed in Plan revision will include the refinement of area allocations with respect to whether motorized or non-motorized uses are allowed. There is a need to review existing direction to determine how the demand for a wider variety of uses and more separation of uses can be met within resource capacity limits.

### **Other Revision Topics**

Planning regulations and fifteen years of PSICC Plan implementation experience were used to identify the following list of additional topics that will be addressed and updated during revision.

### *Special Area Management*

The PSICC includes many unique and outstanding combinations of physical and biological resources, and areas of social interest. These are collectively referred to in the regulations as "special areas." Special areas may include Wilderness (36 CFR 219.17); Wild and Scenic Rivers (36 CFR 219.2); Research Natural Areas (36 CFR 219.25); National Trails, and special recreational areas with scenic, historical (36 CFR 219.24), geological, botanical, zoological, paleontological, archaeological, or other special characteristics. Management direction for all special areas will be updated, based on the uniqueness of the special area and the difference between existing and desired future condition of the resource(s).

### *Research Natural Area (RNA) Recommendations*

Currently the PSICC has 3 RNAs. In the past few years twenty new potential RNAs have been identified on the Pike and San Isabel NFs and eight new potential area on the Comanche & Cimarron NGs. These potential RNAs range in size from a few hundred to a few thousand acres. Based on the diversity of the PSICC, the Forest Service has recognized that additional ecosystems need to be analyzed and recommended for designation as Research Natural Areas.

### *Wild & Scenic Rivers Eligibility Recommendations*

The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of October 1, 1968, as amended, requires the consideration of potential Wild and Scenic Rivers. As part of Plan revision, rivers and streams, determined potentially eligible for inclusion in the wild and Scenic River System, will be analyzed to determine if the "eligible" status is warranted. There is at least one, possibly two, other river segments on the State of Colorado's National Rivers Inventory that may also be within PSICC jurisdiction.

(1) Segments of the Purgatoire River in Otero County, definitely on PSICC lands.

(2) Chacuaco Canyon in Las Animas County. This may not be on the PSICC at all.

Eligibility studies for this (these) river segment(s) will be part of the PSICC Forest Plan revision process. The next step in the process for eligible rivers and streams is suitability analysis. This step will be deferred to a future date.

### *Timber Suitable Acres and Allowable Sale Quantity*

The Forest Service is required (36 CFR 219.14) to determine which lands

are suited and not suited for timber production. This allows an estimate to be made of the potential of the unit to produce a continuous supply of timber. Preliminary analysis shows that the acres of tentatively suitable timber lands on the unit will be significantly less than those identified in the current plan. Alternative levels of commercial timber harvest will be identified in the EIS.

Similarly the suitability, condition, and trend of the Range resource (36 CFR 219.20) will be analyzed and expected levels of grazing will be estimated for Plan Revision Alternatives.

### **Other Potential Changes to the Current Plan**

The Rocky Mountain Region (R2) has developed a set of Management Area prescriptions to promote greater uniformity of direction across adjacent National Forests in the Region. The PSICC will use the R2 Management Area numbering system and use the standard R2 Management Area direction as much as possible. The Revision will incorporate the basic direction and recommendations of the 1995 Recreation Capacity Assessment and Outfitter Guide Allocations and the 1991 Recreation Strategy for the PSICC. The revision will incorporate the Noxious Weed Environmental Assessment recommendations. Plan Revision will decide to retain or close vacant grazing allotments. The Revision will update Goals, Objectives, Standards and Guidelines to meet new national, regional and PSICC priorities.

### **What To Do With This Information**

Written comments on the scope of the issues, topics, and other potential changes identified above are encouraged to be submitted to PSICC by January 31, 2000.

### **Framework for Alternatives To Be Considered**

A range of alternatives will be considered when revising the Plan. The alternatives will address different options to resolve the major issues and other revision topics listed above, and to fulfill the purpose and need for plan revision. A reasonable range of alternatives will be evaluated and reasons will be given for eliminating some alternatives from detailed study. A "no-action alternative" is required. For Plan revision, no action means that current management would continue under the existing Plan. In describing alternatives, desired vegetation and resource conditions will be defined. Resource outputs will be estimated based upon achieving desired

conditions. Some preliminary information is available; however, additional public involvement and collaboration will be needed for alternative development.

### **Involving the Public**

PSICC's primary objective is to maintain an atmosphere of openness throughout the Plan revision process, where all members of the public feel free to share information with the Forest Service on a regular basis. All planning activities will be designed to support open discussions and public involvement that will be sustained on the PSICC after revision is completed.

The Forest Service is seeking information, comments, and assistance from individuals, organizations, tribal governments, and federal, state, and local agencies who may be interested in or affected by Plan revision (36 CFR 219.6) and implementation. "Collaborative stewardship," is defined as caring for the land and serving the people by listening to all constituents and living within the limits of the land, and will be implemented on the PSICC. Many agencies, organizations and individuals have already been cooperating in the development of assessments of current biological, physical, social and economic conditions. This information will be used to prepare the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Public participation will be solicited by notifying in person and/or by mail known interested and affected publics. News releases will be used to give the public general notice. Public participation activities could include (but are not limited to) requests for written comments, open houses, focus groups, field trips, and collaborative forums in numerous locations. Public participation will be sought throughout the revision process and will be especially important at several points along the way. The first formal opportunity to comment is to respond to this notice of intent, which initiates the scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7). Scoping includes: (1) identifying potential issues, (2) from these, identifying significant issues of those that have been covered by prior environmental review, (3) exploring alternatives in addition to No Action, and (4) identifying potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternatives. Additional Public Involvement activities are tentatively proposed to start in the summer of 2000, and will be held at several locations throughout the PSICC area.

**Release and Review of the EIS**

The Draft EIS (DEIS) is proposed to be filed with the Environmental protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public comment in the spring of 2001. At that time, the EPA will publish a notice of availability for the DEIS in the **Federal Register**. The comment period on the DEIS will be 90 days from the date the EPA publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

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 the DEIS must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer's position and contentions; *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 533 (1978). Also environmental objections that could be raised at the DEIS stage but are not raised until after completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) 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 three-month 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 FEIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed actions, comments on the DEIS should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the DEIS or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statements. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulation 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, comments will be analyzed, considered, and responded to by the Forest Service in preparing the Final EIS (FEIS). The FEIS is proposed to be completed in the fall of 2002. The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, environmental consequences discussed in the FEIS, and applicable laws, regulations, and

policies in making decisions regarding these revisions. The responsible official will document the decisions and reasons for the decisions in a Record of Decision for the revised Plans. The decisions will be subject to appeal in accordance with 36 CFR 217.

Dated: September 23, 1999.

**Tom L. Thompson,**

*Acting Regional Forester, Rocky Mountain Region.*

[FR Doc. 99-26174 Filed 10-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-ES-M

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE****Forest Service****Lake Tahoe Basin Federal Advisory Committee**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Lake Tahoe Basin Federal Advisory Committee will hold a meeting on October 29, 1999, at the City of South Lake Tahoe Chamber Office, 1900 Lake Tahoe Blvd., South Lake Tahoe, CA. This Committee, established by the Secretary of Agriculture on December 15, 1998 (64 FR 2876), is chartered to provide advice to the Secretary on implementing the terms of the Federal Interagency Partnership on the Lake Tahoe Region and other matters raised by the Secretary.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held October 29, 1999, beginning at 9:00 a.m. and ending at 4:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the City of South Lake Tahoe Chamber Office, 1900 Lake Tahoe Blvd., South Lake Tahoe, CA.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ed Gee or Jeannie Stafford, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Forest Service, 870 Emerald Bay Road, Suite 1, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150, (530) 573-2642.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The committee will meet jointly with the Lake Tahoe Basin Executives Committees. Items to be covered on the agenda include: (1) Subcommittee Reports; (2) Strategic Planning; (3) Federal Partners, Barriers & Challenges; (4) Washoe Tribal Access; (5) Consensus Discussion; and (6) Open Public. All Lake Tahoe Basin Federal Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public. Interested citizens are encouraged to attend. Issues may be brought to the attention of the Committee during the open public comment period at the meeting or by filing written statements with the secretary for the Committee before or

after the meeting. Please refer any written comments to the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit at the contact address stated above.

Dated: September 30, 1999.

**Edmund Gee,**

*Acting Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 99-26134 Filed 10-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

**COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS****Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the New York State Advisory Committee**

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the New York State Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene at 2:00 p.m. and adjourn at 7:00 p.m. on October 27, 1999, at the Hyatt Regency Buffalo, Franklin Room, 2 Fountain Plaza, Buffalo, New York 14202. The Committee will release its report, *Equal Housing Opportunities in New York: An Evaluation of Section 8 Housing Programs in Buffalo, Rochester and Syracuse*. The Committee will also discuss plans for a new project.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Committee Chairperson Lita Taracido, 212-645-8999, or Ki-Taek Chun, Director of the Eastern Regional Office, 202-376-7533 (TDD 202-376-8116). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least ten (10) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, September 30, 1999.

**Carol-Lee Hurley,**

*Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.*

[FR Doc. 99-26185 Filed 10-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335-01-F

**COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS****Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the North Dakota Advisory Committee**

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the North Dakota Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene at 9 a.m. and