

# Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 60, No. 55

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

## ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

### Notice of Meeting

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby give that the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation will meet on Wednesday, March 29, 1995, in Room 5160 at the Department of the Interior Main Building, 1849 C Street NW., Washington DC beginning at 1:30 p.m.

The Council was established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. Section 470) to advise the President and the Congress on matters relating to historic preservation and to comment upon Federal, federally assisted, and federally licensed undertakings having an effect upon properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The Council's members are the Architect of the Capitol; the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation; the Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency and General Services Administration; the Chairman of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; the President of the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers; a Governor; a Mayor; a Native American; and eight non-Federal members appointed by the President.

The agenda for the meeting includes the following:

- I. Chairman's Welcome/Opening
- II. Discussion of the Draft Policy Statement on Affordable Housing
- III. Discussion of the Proposed Regulations Revisions
- IV. Section 106 Cases
- V. Executive Director's Report
- VI. New Business
- VII. Adjourn

**Note:** The meetings of the Council are open to the public. If you need special accommodations due to a disability, please contact the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Room 809, Washington, DC 202-606-

8503, at least seven (7) days prior the meeting.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Additional information concerning the meeting is available from the Executive Director, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, #809, Washington, DC 20004.

Dated: March 17, 1995.

**Robert D. Bush,**

*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc. 95-7019 Filed 3-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-10-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Commodity Credit Corporation

#### Cotton Storage Agreement Fees

**AGENCY:** Commodity Credit Corporation, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of fees.

**SUMMARY:** The purpose of this notice is to publish a schedule of fees to be paid to Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) by cotton warehouse operators requesting to enter into a storage agreement or renew an existing storage agreement in accordance with the regulations governing the Standards for Approval of Warehouses for Cotton or Cotton Linters (7 CFR 1427.1081 *et seq.*).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 1, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Steven Closson, Warehouse and Inventory Division, Consolidated Farm Service Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, Room 5968-South Building, P.O. Box 2415, Washington, DC 20013, (202) 720-4018.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

In accordance with the provisions of CCC's Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714 *et seq.*), CCC enters into storage agreements with private cotton warehouse operators to provide for the storage of commodities owned by CCC or pledged as security to CCC for price support loans.

The regulation, 7 CFR 1427.1088, requires that all non-Federally licensed cotton warehouse operators in States that do not have a Cooperative Agreement with CCC for warehouse examinations and who do not have an existing agreement with CCC for storage

and handling of CCC-owned commodities or commodities pledged to CCC as loan collateral, but who desire such an agreement, must pay an application and inspection fee prior to CCC conducting the original warehouse examination. After the initial examination and upon execution of the CSA, such cotton warehouse operator must pay the annual contract fee prorated for the first year and the full contract fee annually thereafter in advance of the renewal date of the agreement.

Section 1427.1088 also provides that the amount of the contract fee will be determined and announced in the **Federal Register**. The fee schedule remains effective until changed by CCC. No fee schedule currently is in effect and CCC has not collected fees although the Standards for Approval and the Cotton Storage Agreement (CSA) provides for the collection of such fees. The Department of Agriculture has determined that the user fees will now be collected under the United States Warehouse Act from cotton warehouse operators licensed there under. A cotton user fee schedule was announced in the **Federal Register** effective October 1, 1994. CCC has now determined that a CSA contract fee will be collected from cotton warehouse operators having a CSA and not licensed under the United States Warehouse Act. This notice will establish the schedule of Contract Fees.

#### Determination

The fees set forth herein will be collected by CCC from non-Federally licensed warehouse operators in States which do not have a Cooperative Agreement with CCC for the examination of warehouses and who have entered into a CSA with CCC or who are seeking to enter into a CSA with CCC.

#### Application and Inspection Fees

The Application and Inspection fee will be computed at the rate of \$65 for each 1,000 bales of storage capacity or fraction thereof, but the fee will be not less than \$130 nor more than \$1,300.

#### Contract Fees

The contract fees are as follows:

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

<sup>1</sup>Plus \$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 to 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.*