

with using alfalfa seed or hay commingled with glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa? What are the particular economics of growing seed or hay of organic alfalfa, conventional alfalfa, or glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa? What are the potential changes in the economics of growing and marketing organic and conventional alfalfa that may occur with the use of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa? What are the potential changes in production levels of other crops that may occur with the use of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa (i.e., will the release of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa result in more or fewer acres of corn, wheat, other forage crops, etc.)? What are the potential changes in growing practices, management practices, and crop rotational practices in the production of alfalfa hay or seed for planting or sprouting purposes that may occur with the use of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa? What are the potential changes in the choice of seeds available for organic and conventional alfalfa farmers that may occur with the use of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa?

(12) What are the potential impacts of the deregulation of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa on U.S. trade? If the presence of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa should occur in organic or conventional alfalfa where it is unwanted, unintended, or unexpected, what are the expected impacts on trade with countries that normally import alfalfa seed or hay? What are the expected impacts on trade with countries that do not normally import alfalfa? Is there an expected impact on trade in other commodities?

(13) What is the potential cumulative impact of increased glyphosate usage with the release of glyphosate-tolerant crops? Have changes in glyphosate usage impacted soil quality, water quality, air quality, weed populations, crop rotations, soil microorganisms, diseases, insects, soil fertility, food or feed quality, crop acreages, and crop yields? Does the level of glyphosate tolerance within glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa plants have a major impact on the amount of glyphosate applied on the glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa crop on a routine basis?

(14) What are the potential impacts of the release of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa on threatened or endangered species and designated critical habitat? What are the potential effects of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa use on listed threatened or endangered species, species proposed for listing, designated critical habitat, or habitat proposed for designation? What are the potential effects of glyphosate use on listed threatened or endangered species, species proposed for listing, designated critical habitat, or habitat

proposed for designation; including glyphosate used on glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa?

(15) What are the potential health and safety risks to field workers or other workers that would come into contact with glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa?

(16) Can any of the potential negative environmental impacts resulting from the deregulation of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa be reasonably mitigated and what is the likelihood that mitigation measures will be successfully implemented? The EIS will consider the stewardship measures outlined in the Addendum to section VIII of the petition, as well as any other mitigation measures APHIS considers applicable and viable. Such measures, some of which may be outside the jurisdiction of APHIS, are designed to reduce inadvertent gene flow of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa to negligible levels as well as to monitor and minimize the potential development of glyphosate-tolerant weeds.

(17) What are the impacts of the mitigation measures on coexistence with organic and conventional alfalfa production and export markets?

(18) Are there any other potential direct, indirect or cumulative impacts from the release of glyphosate-tolerant alfalfa other than those mentioned above?

Comments that identify other issues or alternatives that should be examined in the EIS would be especially helpful. APHIS realizes that alfalfa growth, crop management, and crop utilization (seed versus hay or forage) may vary considerably by geographic region, and therefore, when providing comments on a topic or issue, please provide relevant information on the specific locality or region in question.

We will fully consider all comments we receive in developing a final scope of analysis for the draft EIS. When the draft EIS is completed, we will publish a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing its availability and inviting public comment.

Done in Washington, DC, this 28th day of December 2007.

**Kevin Shea,**

*Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*

[FR Doc. E7-25662 Filed 1-4-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-34-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS-2007-0155]

### General Conference Committee of the National Poultry Improvement Plan; Meeting

**AGENCY:** Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** We are giving notice of a meeting of the General Conference Committee of the National Poultry Improvement Plan.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held on January 23, 2008, from 1:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Georgia World Congress Center, 285 Andrew Young International Boulevard, NW., Atlanta, GA.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Andrew R. Rhorer, Senior Coordinator, National Poultry Improvement Plan, VS, APHIS, 1498 Klondike Road, Suite 101, Conyers, GA 30094; (770) 922-3496.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The General Conference Committee (the Committee) of the National Poultry Improvement Plan (NPIP), representing cooperating State agencies and poultry industry members, serves an essential function by acting as liaison between the poultry industry and the Department in matters pertaining to poultry health. In addition, the Committee assists the Department in planning, organizing, and conducting the NPIP Biennial Conference.

Topics for discussion at the upcoming meeting include:

1. Appointment of a Member-at-Large;
2. National animal identification program for poultry;
3. Portland, ME, Biennial Planning Conference and proposed changes to the NPIP;
4. Compartmentalization of notifiable avian influenza free zones;
5. Interstate and intrastate movement of table eggs in the event of a highly pathogenic avian influenza outbreak;
6. Update on *Mycoplasma* diseases;
7. Update on *Salmonella enteritidis* and *S. montevideo*;
8. National Chicken Council report; and
9. Proposed changes to the NPIP for 2008.

The meeting will be open to the public. However, due to time constraints, the public will not be allowed to participate in the discussions during the meeting. Written statements

on meeting topics may be filed with the Committee before or after the meeting by sending them to the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. Written statements may also be filed at the meeting. Please refer to Docket No. APHIS-2007-0155 when submitting your statements.

This notice of meeting is given pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Done in Washington, DC, this 31st day of December 2007.

**Kevin Shea,**

*Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*

[FR Doc. E8-13 Filed 1-4-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-34-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Plumas National Forest; California; Moonlight Fire Recovery and Restoration Project

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

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

**SUMMARY:** The USDA, Forest Service, Plumas National Forest will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposal to harvest fire-killed trees on approximately 14,000 acres in the Moonlight Fire area. The Moonlight Fire burned about 65,000 acres in September 2007 on the Plumas National Forest.

**DATES:** The draft environmental impact statement is expected in June 2008 and the final environmental impact statement is expected in September 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Rich Bednarski, Interdisciplinary Team Leader, Mt. Hough Ranger District, 39696 Highway 70, Quincy, CA 95971. Comments may be: (1) Mailed; (2) hand delivered between the hours of 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. weekdays Pacific Time; (3) faxed to (530) 283-1821; or (4) electronically mailed to: *comments-pacificsouthwest-plumas-mthough@fs.fed.us*. Please indicate the name "Moonlight Fire Recovery and Restoration Project" on the subject line of your email. Comments submitted electronically must be in Rich Text Format (.rtf) or Word (.doc).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rich Bednarski, Interdisciplinary Team Leader, Mt. Hough Ranger District, 39696 Highway 70, Quincy, CA 95971. Telephone: (530) 283-7641 or electronic address: *rbednarski@fs.fed.us*.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The proposed action is designed to meet the

standards and guidelines for land management activities in the Plumas National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (1988), as amended by the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group (HFQLG) Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) (1999, 2003), and as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment FSEIS and ROD (2004).

The proposed project is located in Plumas County, California, within the Mt. Hough Ranger District of the Plumas National Forest. It is located in all or portions of Sections 13, 23-27, 34-35, T28N, R10E; all or portions of Sections 13-14, 17-19, 23-24, 29-34, T28N, R11E; all or portions of Sections 19-20, 29-32, T28N, R12E; all or portions of Sections 1-2, 13-14, 23-25, T27N, R10E; all or portions of Section 2-11, 13-15, 17, 19-22, 25, 35-36, T27N, R11E; and all or portions of Sections 5, 8, 17-20, 29-32, T27N, R12E.

#### Purpose and Need for Action

The purpose of the project would be to contribute to the stability and economic health of rural communities. The project would provide for local economic benefit by creating jobs from the sale of dead merchantable trees, as well as contribute to local and regional areas with net revenues and receipts. The wood quality, volume, and value of dead trees deteriorate rapidly. The value of trees would cover the cost of their removal and possibly other activities associated with the project.

As a result of the Moonlight Fire, thousands of acres burned with high vegetation burn severity resulting in deforested condition. As a result, shrub species will dominate these areas for decades and experience a delay in returning to a forested condition. The early establishment of conifers through reforestation will expedite forest regeneration.

#### Proposed Action

The proposed action would harvest fire-killed conifer trees on approximately 14,000 acres using the following methods: Ground based, skyline, and helicopter. Trees greater than 14 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) would be whole tree harvested on the ground-based areas. Trees less than 14 inches dbh would be removed as biomass material on the ground-based areas. About 600 acres would have trees less than 14 inches dbh removed as biomass material. Ground-based equipment would be restricted to slopes less than 35 percent, except on decomposed granitic soils where equipment would be restricted to slopes

less than 25 percent. On the skyline and helicopter areas, trees greater than 16 inches dbh would be harvested. Limbs and tops in the skyline and helicopter areas would be lopped and scattered to a depth less than 18 inches in height. Skyline yarding would require one end suspension, with full suspension over intermittent or perennial streams. Fire-killed conifers would be harvested from Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas. Equipment restriction zone widths within Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas would be established based on the stream type and steepness of the slope adjacent to the streams. Snags would be retained in snag retention areas, that are approximately ten acres in size, on approximately ten percent of the project area. Salvage harvest would not occur within the snag retention areas except for operability (safety) reasons. Approximately 25 miles of temporary roads would be constructed. Approximately 20 acres (nine landings) of helicopter landings would be constructed. Excess fuels on landings would be piled, a fireline constructed around the piles, and the piles burned. Following completion of the project, the temporary roads and landings would be subsoiled, reforested, and closed. Approximately 14,000 acres would be reforested with conifer seedlings in widely spaced clusters to emulate a naturally established forest. The areas would be reforested with a mixture of native species.

The Moonlight Fire impacted twenty California spotted owl Protected Activity Centers (PACs). According to the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment FSEIS and ROD (2004), page 37, after a stand-replacing event, the habitat conditions are evaluated within a 1.5 mile radius around the activity center to identify opportunities for re-mapping the PAC. If there is insufficient suitable habitat for designating a PAC within the 1.5 mile radius, the PAC may be removed from the network.

#### Possible Alternatives

In addition to the proposed action, a no action alternative would be analyzed. Additional alternatives may be developed and analyzed throughout the environmental analysis.

#### Lead and Cooperating Agencies

The USDA, Forest Service is the lead agency for this proposal.

#### Responsible Official

Alice B. Carlton, Plumas National Forest Supervisor, P.O. Box 11500, Quincy, CA 95971.