

National Forests, 2840 Kachina Drive, Pueblo, Colorado 81008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Hill, Planning Staff Officer, at above address or by phone at (719)–553–1414, or by e-mail at jjhill01@fs.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A portion of the river was studied in the early 1980's during preparation of PSICC's Forest Plan. That portion was between Cheesman and Elevemile Reservoirs and was found eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System, but a decision was not made regarding the river's suitability (*i.e.*, whether it would be an appropriate addition to the System). The study of other portions of the rivers was postponed due to the pending proposal to construct Two Forks Reservoir, which was eventually denied by the Environmental Protection Agency in the 1990's.

The current study began in the early 1990's. It included the previous study area plus the river below Cheesman Reservoir to Stontia Springs Reservoir and the North Fork. Previous documents in this study include the Draft Legislative EIS (April 1997) and a Supplemental Draft Legislative EIS (March 2000). These documents were labeled "legislative" under the presumption that a recommendation would be made to Congress to designate some or all of the eligible river segments in the study. However, under the Final EIS's Preferred Alternative, no decisions on suitability is contemplated. Therefore no recommendation to Congress would be forthcoming and accordingly the modifier "legislative" is not employed.

The Preferred Alternative includes a proposed amendment to the PSICC Forest Plan. An amendment had been contemplated in the Supplemental Draft EIS, but only as an item that would be consistent with whatever alternative was selected for implementation. Its details had not been developed in that document. However, public response indicated a need to review the amendment prior to its being selected in a decision document. In light of this, the Record of Decision is being postponed to provide an opportunity for comment on the proposed amendment. Comments are due April 2, 2004.

Copies of the Final EIS are being provided to entities known to be interested in the study. For others who are interested in reading the document, it has been posted on the web at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/psicc/projects/wsr/>.

Dated: January 21, 2004.

Robert J. Leaverton,

Forest Supervisor, Pike and San Isabel National Forests, Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands.

[FR Doc. 04–1619 Filed 1–26–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–ES–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Tehama County Resource Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Tehama County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) will meet in Red Bluff, California. Agenda items to be covered include: Introductions, Approval of Minutes, Public Comment, Chairman Report, Reports from Committees, Presentation of Projects/Possible Action, General Discussion, Next Agenda.

DATES: The meeting will be held on February 12, 2004 from 9 a.m. and end at approximately 12 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Lincoln Street School, Conference Room A, 1135 Lincoln Street, Red Bluff, CA. Individuals wishing to speak or propose agenda items must send their names and proposals to Jim Giachino, DFO, 825 N. Humboldt Ave., Willows, CA 95988.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bobbin Gaddini, Committee Coordinator, USDA, Mendocino National Forest, Grindstone Ranger District, P.O. Box 164, Elk Creek, CA 95939. (530) 968–5329; e-mail ggaddin@fs.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting is open to the public. Committee discussion is limited to Forest Service staff and Committee members. However, persons who wish to bring matters to the attention of the Committee may file written statements with the Committee staff before or after the meeting. Public input sessions will be provided and individuals who made written requests by February 10, 2004 will have the opportunity to address the committee at those sessions.

Dated: January 21, 2004.

James F. Giachino,

Designated Federal Official.

[FR Doc. 04–1618 Filed 1–26–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Business-Cooperative Service

Maximum Portion of Guarantee Authority Available for Fiscal Year 2004

AGENCY: Rural Business-Cooperative Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As set forth in 7 CFR part 4279, subpart B, each fiscal year the Agency shall establish a limit on the maximum portion of guarantee authority available for that fiscal year that may be used to guarantee loans with a guarantee fee of 1 percent or guaranteed loans with a guarantee percentage exceeding 80 percent.

Allowing the guarantee fee to be reduced to 1 percent or exceeding the 80 percent guarantee on certain guaranteed loans that meet the conditions set forth in 7 CFR 4279.107 and 4279.119 will increase the Agency's ability to focus guarantee assistance on projects which the Agency has found particularly meritorious, such as projects in rural communities that remain persistently poor, which experience long-term population decline and job deterioration, are experiencing trauma as a result of natural disaster, or are experiencing fundamental structural changes in the economic base.

Not more than 12 percent of the Agency's quarterly apportioned guarantee authority will be reserved for loan requests with a guarantee fee of 1 percent, and not more than 15 percent of the Agency's quarterly apportioned guarantee authority will be reserved for guaranteed loan requests with a guarantee percentage exceeding 80 percent. Once the above quarterly limits have been reached, all additional loans guaranteed during the remainder of that quarter will require a 2 percent guarantee fee and not exceed an 80 percent guarantee limit. As an exception to this paragraph and for the purposes of this notice, loans developed by the North American Development Bank (NADBank) Community Adjustment and Investment Program (CAIP) will not count against the 15 percent limit. Up to 50 percent of CAIP loans may have a guarantee percentage exceeding 80 percent. The funding authority for CAIP loans is not derived from carryover or recovered funding authority of the Business and Industry (B&I) Guaranteed Loan Program.

Written requests by the Rural Development State Office for approval of a guaranteed loan with a 1 percent guarantee fee or a guaranteed loan