

A Federal Seed Analysis Certificate is issued giving the test results. Most of the seed tested under this program is scheduled for export. Many importing countries require a Federal Seed analysis Certificate on U.S. seed.

The only information collected is information needed to provide the service requested by the applicant. This includes information to identify the seed being tested, the seed treatment (if treated with a pesticide), the tests to be performed, and any other appropriate information required by the applicant to be on the Federal Seed Analysis Certificate.

The number of seed companies applying for the seed testing service has increased from 65 to 82 during the past 3 years due to an increase in the number of companies exporting seed. The total number of samples received for testing has increased also. Therefore, the average burden for information collection has remained about the same for seed companies applying for the service.

The information in this collection is used only by authorized AMS employees to track, test, and report results to the applicant.

*Estimate of Burden:* Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average .25 hours per response.

*Respondents:* Applicants for seed testing service.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 82.

*Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent:* 24.3.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 498.5 hours.

Comments are invited on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments may be sent to Richard C. Payne, Chief, Seed Regulatory and Testing Branch, LS, AMS, USDA, 801 Summit Crossing Place, Suite C, Gastonia, North Carolina 28054-2193 or by E-mail to [richard.payne2@usda.gov](mailto:richard.payne2@usda.gov). All comments received will be available

for public inspection during regular business hours at the same address.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Dated: July 9, 2003.

**A.J. Yates,**

*Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.*

[FR Doc. 03-17801 Filed 7-14-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### **Revised Southeast Geographic Area Rangeland Allotment Management Plans on Some National Forest System Lands on the Buffalo Gap National Grassland in South Dakota**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement in conjunction with the revision of allotment management plans.

**SUMMARY:** Revise Rangeland Allotment Management Plans (RAMP) for all allotments within the Fall River Southeast Geographic Area (FRSEGA) and the Fox Allotment whose boundary lies within the Fall River West Geographic Area (FRWGA), and analyze continuation of grazing within the constraints of the Revised Nebraska Land and Resource Management Plan (NLRMP).

**DATES:** Comments concerning the scope of the analysis must be received within 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. The draft environmental impact statement is expected August 2003 and the final environmental impact statement is expected October 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to: Mike Erk, Interdisciplinary Team Leader, USDA Forest Service, PO Box 732, 1801 Highway 18 By-pass, Hot Springs, SD 57747.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mike Erk, Interdisciplinary Team Leader, USDA Forest Service, PO Box 732, 1801 Highway 18 By-pass, Hot Springs, SD 57547. Phone (605) 745-4107

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Purpose and Need for Action:* The purpose of the EIS is to determine current conditions, analyze environmental consequences of actions to these conditions, and assist the decision maker in selecting management/monitoring strategies

consistent with meeting desired condition sin the NLRMP. The need for the action is to reverse undesirable conditions, and ensure that authorized uses and associated management activities move them towards desired NLRMP conditions.

*Proposed Action:* The Fall River Ranger District proposes to implement best management practices and activities with adaptive management and monitoring strategies to ensure there are no disparities between current conditions and NLRMP desired conditions.

*Possible Alternatives:* No-Action Alternative is to not change current permitted uses. No-Use alternative is to eliminate any uses on the project area.

*Responsible Official:* Michael E. McNeill, District Ranger, Fall River Ranger District, PO Box 732, 1801 Highway 18 By-pass, Hot Springs, SD 57747.

*Nature Of Decision To Be Made:* The decision to be made is whether or not to continue permitted uses within the project area. If uses are permitted, then adaptive management strategies and monitoring will be identified to ensure compliance with desired NLRMP conditions.

*Scoping Process:* The agency sent a letter to interested parties on April 30, 2003 requesting comments concerning the scope of the analysis. Comments were due by May 20, 2003.

*Release and Review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:* The draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public comment by August 2003. 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 45 days from the date the EPA publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

Reviewers of the DEIS 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 Com. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the DEIS stage but are not raised until after completion 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