

better facilitate adaptive management and public collaboration.

2. The new rule focuses more on the goals of ecological, social, and economic sustainability and less on prescriptive means of producing goods and services.

3. The Responsible Official who will approve the final plan will now be the Forest Supervisor instead of the Regional Forester.

4. The forests will establish an environmental management system (per ISO 14001:2004(E)) prior to completion of the revised forest plan.

5. The emphasis of public involvement will be a collaborative effort between the public and the Forest Service to incorporate the most desirable management options into a single broadly supported management direction package that will become the Forest Plan.

6. Administrative review will change from a post-decision appeals process to a predecision objection process.

Public Involvement:

There has been a great deal of public participation and collaborative work on this planning process over the past few years, including more than 75 public meetings. Results of this work and a preliminary proposed action are available for review and comment. Current information and details of public participation opportunities are posted on our Web site: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r4/dixie/projects/FParea/HomePage.htm>. Contact Ellen Row at (435) 896-9233, or email at, ellenrow@fs.fed.us to be placed on our mailing list.

ADDRESSES: Mailing address: Dixie and Fishlake Forest Plan Revision, 115 E 900 North, Richfield UT, 84701.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frank Fay, Planning Team Leader, Fishlake National Forest, (435) 896-9233 or email: ffay@fs.fed.us; or view our Web site at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r4/dixie/projects/FParea/HomePage.htm>.

DATES: Transition is effective immediately upon publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

Responsible Officials: Robert A. Russell, Forest Supervisor, Cedar City, Dixie National Forest, 1789 N. Wedgewood Lane, Cedar City UT, 84720. Mary C. Erickson, Forest Supervisor, Richfield, Fishlake National Forest, 115 E 900 North, Richfield UT, 84701.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Dixie and Fishlake National Forests are separate administrative units with separate forest plans. However, due to similar ecology, interested publics, and financial resources, the two forest plans are being revised with a single planning

team. In May of 2002, the forests formally initiated a land management plan revision process with publication of a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for plan revision. The forests began an extensive public participation and collaboration process. The planning team has been working on comprehensive analyses of conditions and trends for the ecological, social and economic components of the plan area and related scales of analysis.

The first phase of public participation was focused primarily on development of "vision" statements, desired conditions, management issues, and suitable land uses to be incorporated into the preliminary proposed action. Over sixty community meetings were conducted in this effort. During the second phase, the planning team met with the public to review the content of the preliminary proposal and to get feedback as to its desirability and feasibility. The review and feedback phase is ongoing. The planning team will draft a summary of findings from the analyses of ecological, social, and economic conditions in the form of a Comprehensive Evaluation Report. Many of these analyses have already been developed with and reviewed by public participants. We are still accepting feedback on the preliminary proposed action and the analyses. We will use these comments to further modify the plan proposal. The planning team will take additional collaborative steps to finish the draft plan components and to identify potential options. Remaining work includes drafting a summary of condition and trend analyses, plan components for formal review and comment, a monitoring program, and an environmental management system.

This is an open planning process with numerous opportunities for the public to obtain information, provide comment, or participate in collaborative stakeholder activities. The focal points of future collaborative work will be: (1) Review and adjustment of the preliminary proposed action (2) identification and development of management objectives to assist in attaining or maintaining desired conditions, (3) formulation of guidelines to serve as operational controls to help ensure projects move toward or maintain desired conditions, and (4) development of the plan monitoring framework and environmental management system to guide adaptive management. We expect to complete this phase of collaboration by early Fall of 2005. Our remaining forest plan

revision schedule will be approximately as follows:

Release of Draft Forest Plan and start of 90-day public comment period.	Winter 2005-06
Release of Final Plans and start of 30-day objection period.	Summer 2006
Final decision and start of plan implementation.	Fall 2006

Please see our website to review proposed management direction in progress and other details.

Dated: July 25, 2005.

Robert A. Russell,

Forest Supervisor, Dixie National Forest.

Dated: July 22, 2005.

Mary C. Erickson,

Forest Supervisor, Fishlake National Forest.

[FR Doc. 05-15424 Filed 8-3-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-ES-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Plumas County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC)

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Plumas County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) will hold a meeting on August 5, 2005, in Portola, CA. The primary purpose of the meeting is to review Plumas National Forest Supervisor Cycle 5 project funding decisions, in addition to presentations on national RAC survey findings and various recreation topics. RAC project funding recommendations were made at a prior meeting on June 8. A short field trip will follow.

DATES AND ADDRESSES: The August 5, 2005 meeting will take place from 9-12 at the Eastern Plumas Hospital Education Center, 500 1st Street, Portola, CA. Additionally, a short field trip to the Plumas Eureka Estates thinning project will take place from 1-2:30, convening at the Beckwourth Ranger District office at 23 Mohawk Highway Road, Blairsden, CA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lee Anne Schramel Taylor, Forest Coordinator, USDA, Plumas National Forest, P.O. Box 11500/159 Lawrence Street, Quincy, CA 95971; (530) 283-7850; or by e-mail eataylor@fs.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Agenda items for the August 5 meeting include: (1) Review Forest Supervisor Cycle 5 funding decisions; (2) Review Corridor project, discuss, and make a recommendation, (3) Presentation: national RAC survey findings, (4)

Presentation: various recreation topics, and (5) Future meeting schedule/logistics/agenda. The meetings are open to the public and individuals may address the Committee after being recognized by the Chair. Other RAC information including previous meeting agendas and minutes may be obtained at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/payments>.

Dated: July 28, 2005.

Fred J. Krueger,

Public Services Staff Officer.

[FR Doc. 05-15408 Filed 8-3-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Natural Resources Conservation Service

Big Delta State Historical Park Streambank Protection Project, Big Delta, AK

AGENCY: Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA.

ACTION: Finding of No Significant Impact according to the Environmental Assessment.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; the Council on Environmental Quality Guidelines (40 CFR part 1500); and the Natural Resources Conservation Service Guidelines (7 CFR part 650); the Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, gives notice of a Finding of No Significant Impact according to the Environmental Assessment of the Big Delta State Historical Park Streambank Protection Project.

DATES: July 9, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert Jones, State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service, 800 West Evergreen, Suite 100, Palmer, Alaska, 99645-6539, telephone: 907-761-7760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Environmental Assessment of this Federally assisted action indicates that there will be no significant environmental impacts. As a result of these findings, Robert Jones, State Conservationist, has determined that the project should be completed as outlined in the assessment document.

The objective of the Big Delta State Historical Park Streambank Protection Project is to install streambank protection measures to control erosion and protect the historic district while minimizing disturbance to the fall chum spawning habitat. The selected

alternative is a combination of Bio-engineering Methods including the construction of two rock vanes. Alternatives evaluated were No Action, Combination of Bio-Engineering Methods and Combination of Bio-Engineering Methods Including Construction of Two Vanes. The selected alternative is the combination of bio-engineering methods with the two rock vanes. This alternative was selected because it protects the river bank adjacent to the Big Delta State Historical Park, minimizes the constructed footprint in the fall chum spawning habitat, and maintains the aesthetic qualities of the site. The vanes result in no significant rise in the flood waters in Tanana River.

A limited number of copies of the EA are available to fill single copy requests at the above address. Basic data developed during the environmental assessment are on file and may be reviewed by contacting Robert Jones.

Further information on the proposed action may be obtained from Robert Jones, State Conservationist, at the above address.

Dated: July 9, 2005.

Robert Jones,

State Conservationist.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires Federal agencies to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. I have preliminarily determined, based upon the evaluation of impacts in the Environmental Assessment (EA), attached hereto and made a part hereof, and the reasons provided below, that there will be no significant individual or cumulative impacts on the quality of the human environment as a result of implementing the Big Delta State Historical Park Streambank Protection Project in Big Delta, Alaska. In particular, there will be none of the significant adverse impacts which NEPA is intended to help decision makers avoid and mitigate against. Therefore, an EIS is not required.

High water events in 1997 and 1998 led to accelerated rates of erosion along the bank of the Tanana River bordering Big Delta State Historical Park, particularly in front of Rika's Roadhouse. Big Delta Historic District is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is the only historic complex of buildings remaining in an *in situ* context within the Delta Junction area. The reach of the Tanana River bordering the Big Delta State Historical

Park is a critical spawning area for fall chum and is considered essential fish habitat under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The project purpose is to address 1000 feet of river bank erosion bordering the Big Delta State Historical Park while minimizing the impact to the fall chum salmon spawning habitat. Congress has authorized funding for this project in the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) budget.

Issues regarding impacts to the essential fish habitat in the Tanana River, cultural resources, vegetation, economic and other resource concerns were identified (EA, pages 10-14). Each of the alternatives considered in the EA is examined in regard to these concerns.

Three alternatives along with a "no action" alternative were examined (EA, pages 7-10). The alternatives provide various levels of riverbank protection for the Big Delta State Historical Park and varying levels of impacts to fall chum salmon spawning habitat. The selected alternative was Alternative 3, Combination of Bio-engineering Methods Including Construction of Two Rock Vanes. This alternative was selected because it protects the river bank adjacent to the Big Delta State Historical Park, minimizes the constructed footprint in the fall chum spawning habitat, and maintains the aesthetic qualities of the site (EA, page 15).

Based on the information presented in the attached Big Delta State Historical Park Streambank Protection Project EA, I find that the proposed action is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an EIS will not be prepared.

[FR Doc. 05-15379 Filed 8-3-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-428-825, A-475-824, A-588-845, A-580-834, A-201-822, A-583-831, C-475-825, C-580-835]

Continuation of Antidumping Duty Orders on Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Germany, Italy, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, and Taiwan, and Countervailing Duty Orders on Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Italy and the Republic of Korea

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: As a result of the determinations by the Department of