

TWELVE-MONTH CONTRACT FEE
SCHEDULE

Location capacity (bales)	Contract fees (dollars)
1 to 20,000	\$500
20,001 to 40,000	650
40,001 to 60,000	800
60,001 to 80,000	1,000
80,001 to 100,000	1,250
100,001 to 120,000	1,500
120,001 to 140,000	1,750
140,001 to 160,000	2,000
160,001 +	12,250

¹Plus \$50.00 per 5,000 bale capacity or fraction thereof above 160,000 bales.

Signed at Washington, DC on March 16, 1995.

Bruce R Weber,

Acting Executive Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation.

[FR Doc 95-7049 Filed 3-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-05-P

Forest Service

Zaca Mine Project Toiyabe National Forest, Alpine County, California

AGENCY: Forest Service.

ACTION: Cancellation of notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The Department of Agriculture, Forest Service and Alpine County Planning Department have cancelled preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/EIR) for the Zaca Mine Project following withdrawal of the proposal by Western States Minerals Corporation. Public comments regarding this project are no longer needed. The Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS was originally published on February 8, 1995 in the **Federal Register**, Volume 60, NO. 26, pages 7518-7519.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions regarding this notice may be directed to Maureen Joplin, Project Team Leader, Toiyabe National Forest, 1200 Franklin Way, Sparks, NV, 89431; telephone: 702-355-5394.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Western States Minerals Corporation (WSM) has withdrawn its proposed Plan of Operations (POO) for an open pit/cyanide heap leach gold/silver mine in Alpine County, California. The project would have been located approximately four miles southeast of Markleeville in sections 29, 30, 31 and 32, T10N R21E, M.D.M. Total area of proposed disturbances was 228 acres. Forest Service and Alpine County were in the process of collecting comments from

other agencies and the public when WSM withdrew its proposed plan. WSM offered the following statement:

“Western States Minerals Corporation has decided to discontinue permitting of its wholly owned Zaca Project at this time. This decision is based entirely upon economic reasons. The Company has other Projects that it will develop at this time, because they appear to be more economically viable in the present business climate. Western States Minerals Corporation fully intends to develop the Zaca Project at some future date.”

Dated: March 10, 1995.

Gary Sayer,

Deputy Forest Supervisor, Toiyabe National Forest.

[FR Doc. 95-6961 Filed 3-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Rangeland Health; Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Box Elder, Cache, Rich, Tooele, Weber, Morgan, Summit Counties, Utah and Uinta County, Wyoming

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

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

SUMMARY: The Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement on a proposal to amend the Wasatch-Cache National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan to add management direction and standards and guidelines for desired future condition of rangelands.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be received in writing by April 20, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to William P. LeVere, Deputy Forest Supervisor, 8236 Federal Building, 125 South State St., Salt Lake City, Utah 84138.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Reese Pope, Planning Staff Officer, (801) 524-5188.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Wasatch-Cache National Forest is proposing to amend the Wasatch-Cache National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan to add management direction and standards and guidelines for desired future condition of rangelands. The desired future condition of four range types will be defined: Riparian, uplands, alpine, and aspen. Riparian areas will be managed for mid-to-late seral ecological conditions to maintain or restore biological, physical, and aesthetic values of riparian ecosystems. Uplands will be managed for mid-to-late seral

status to maintain watershed conditions. Alpine areas will be managed for protective ground cover with a diversified vegetative cover.

Management of aspen will be to maintain and improve aspen sites and associated vegetation. Specific utilization standards and stubble heights will be set to move toward desired rangeland conditions.

A scoping document has been sent to 700 individuals and organizations and local and state government agencies. Preliminary issues identified by the interdisciplinary team include effects on threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, effects on riparian areas and upland watershed conditions, effects on local economies, effects on rangeland from livestock and wildlife, effects on recreational values and visual resources and effects on range condition on important wildlife habitat. Two preliminary alternatives have been identified. The proposed action which would amend the Forest Plan with new management direction for rangelands and the No Action which would continue setting direction in individual allotment management plans.

The public is invited to submit comments or suggestions to the address above. The responsible official is William LeVere, Deputy Forest Supervisor. A draft EIS is expected to be filed in May of 1995 and the final EIS filed in August of 1995.

The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency's notice of availability appears in the **Federal Register**. It is very important that those interested in the proposed action participate at that time. To be the most helpful, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible and may address the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed (see The Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3).

In addition, Federal court decisions have established that reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewers' position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. *City of Angoon v.*

Hodel, (9th Circuit, 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). The reason for this is to ensure 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 final.

Dated: March 14, 1995.

William P. LeVere,

Deputy Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 95-6974 Filed 3-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Timber Bridge Research Joint Venture Agreements; Solicitation of Applications and Application Guidelines

Program Description

Purpose

The Federal Highway Administration and the USDA, Forest Service, Forest Products Laboratory (FPL), are working cooperatively under Public Law 102-240, The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991, on research for the development of wood in transportation structures.

The FPL is now inviting proposals for specific areas of the research under the authority of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 3318(b) and will award competitive Research Joint Venture Agreements for cooperative research related to wood in transportation structures. The specific research areas are stated within this announcement.

Eligibility

Proposals may be submitted by any Federal Agency, university, private business, non profit organization, or any research or engineering entity.

An applicant must qualify as a responsible applicant in order to be eligible for an award. To qualify as responsible, an applicant must meet the following standards:

(a) Adequate financial resources for performance, the necessary experience, organizational and technical qualifications, and facilities, or a firm commitment, arrangement, or ability to obtain same (including any to be obtained through subagreement (s)) or contracts;

(b) Ability to comply with the proposed or required completion schedule for the project;

(c) Adequate financial management system and audit procedures that provide efficient and effective accountability and control of all funds, property, and other assets;

(d) Satisfactory record of integrity, judgment, and performance, including, in particular, any prior performance under grants, agreements, and contracts from the Federal government; and

(e) Otherwise be qualified and eligible to receive an award under the applicable laws and regulations.

Available Funding

Available funding is shown under the specific research areas, below. The FPL will reimburse the cooperator not-to-exceed eighty percent (80%) of the total cost of the research. The proposing entity may contribute the indirect costs as its portion of the total cost of the research.

Indirect costs will be reimbursed to State Cooperative Institutions. State Cooperative Institutions are designated by the following:

(a) The Act of July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301 and the following), commonly known as the First Morrill Act;

(b) The Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321 and the following), commonly known as the Second Morrill Act, including the Tuskegee Institute;

(c) The Act of March 2, 1887 (7 U.S.C. 361a and the following), commonly known as the Hatch Act of 1887;

(d) The Act of May 8, 1914 (7 U.S.C. 341 and the following), commonly known as the Smith-Lever Act;

(e) The Act of October 10, 1962 (16 U.S.C. 582a and the following), commonly known as the McIntire-Stennis Act of 1962; and

(f) Sections 1429 through 1439 (Animal Health and Disease Research), sections 1474 through 1483 (Rangeland Research) of Public Law 95-113, as amended by Public Law 97-98.

Definitions

(a) Grants, Agreements, and Licensing Officer means the Grants, Agreements, and Licensing Officer of the FPL and any other officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture to whom the authority involved may be delegated.

(b) Awarding Official means the Grants, Agreements, and Licensing Officer and any other officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture to whom the authority to issue or modify awards has been delegated.

(c) Budget Period means the interval of time (usually twelve months) into which the project period is divided for budgetary and reporting purposes.

(d) Department or USDA means the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

(e) Research Joint Venture Agreement means the award by the Grants, Agreements, and Licensing Officer or his/her designee to a cooperator to assist

in meeting the costs of conducting, for the benefit of the public, an identified project which is intended and designed to establish, discover, elucidate, or confirm information or the underlying mechanisms relating to a research problem area identified herein.

(f) Cooperator means the entity designated in the Research Joint Venture Agreement award document as the responsible legal entity to whom a Research Joint Venture Agreement is awarded.

(g) Methodology means the project approach to be followed to carry out the project.

(h) Peer Review Group means an assembled group of experts or consultants qualified by training and/or experience in particular scientific or technical field to give expert advice on the technical merit of grant applications in those fields.

(i) Principal Investigator means an individual who is responsible for the scientific and technical direction of the project, as designated by the cooperator in the application and approved by the Grants, Agreements, and Licensing Officer.

(j) Project means the particular activity within the scope of one or more of the research areas identified herein.

(k) Project Period means the total time approved by the Grants, Agreements, and Licensing Officer for conducting the proposed project as outlined in an approved application or the approved portions thereof.

(l) Research means any systematic study directed toward new or fuller knowledge of the subject field.

Areas: Proposals are currently being solicited in the following areas:

(a) Problem Area I: Copper Naphthenate Preservative for Bridge Applications. To develop a method for the separation and analysis of naphthenic acid components of copper naphthenate preservatives and to determine the relative efficacy of these components to decay fungi. Total estimated cost of the research: \$60,000; estimated Federal funding: \$48,000.

(b) Problem Area II: Development of Crash-Tested Bridge Railings. To develop and evaluate by full-scale crash testing two bridge railing systems, each including the bridge railing and the approach railing transition, for glued laminated timber bridges constructed of longitudinal girders and transverse deck panels. Total estimated cost of the research: \$242,500; estimated Federal funding: \$194,000.

(c) Problem Area III: Manual for Timber Bridge Inspection. To develop a comprehensive, stand-alone reference on the inspection of timber highway