

fragmentation, and open road densities; and for wild and scenic study river interim management.

PRELIMINARY ISSUES: The Forest Service has identified five issues which were addressed in the EA:

1. Effect of each alternative on land ownership status.
2. Effect of the project on soil and water resources.
3. Effect of the project on the habitat of the Snake River spring/summer chinook salmon and other, sensitive fish species.
4. Effect of the roads on the eligibility and suitability of the Secesh River for designation as a wild and scenic river.
5. Effect of the project on wildlife species that depend on meadow ecosystems, and how the project affects the habitat of the endangered gray wolf and other sensitive wildlife species.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES: The Forest Service has identified five possible alternatives to the Proposed Action: No Action alternative, Denial of Permit and Closure of Unauthorized Roads, Proponent Request, Roads #1 and #2 only, and Minimum Access Alternative.

DECISIONS TO BE MADE: The Payette National Forest Supervisor will decide:

Whether a permit should be issued to allow construction and/or reconstruction, use, and maintenance of roads to access Secesh River Subdivisions #1 and #2.

If a permit is issued, then how many and which proposed roads will be constructed and/or reconstructed.

If a permit is issued, then what standard of roads will be constructed and/or reconstructed.

If a permit is issued, then what mitigation measures, management requirement, and monitoring will be implemented. And, What Forest Plan amendment(s) are required.

AGENCY/PUBLIC CONTACTS: As part of the EA process, the Forest Service conducted two scoping processes in 1993 and 1994, contacting 31 groups, agencies, and individuals; 13 scoping responses were received. The EA was sent out for predecisional review November 21, 1994 to 69 individuals and agencies; six responses were received. To initiate the EIS, the Forest Service is mailing a letter to those who have expressed interest in this project in the past.

SCHEDULE: Draft Environmental Impact Statement, March 1995. Final EIS May 1995. Implementation, June 1995. Project decision and implementation are contingent on completion of consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

COMMENTS: Comments on the Proposed Action and the analysis should be received in writing on or before March 2, 1995. Send comments to: Forest Supervisor, Payette National Forest, P.O. Box 1026, 106 W. Park Street, McCall, ID 83638; telephone (208) 634-0700; FAX (208) 634-0281.

The comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, 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 reviewer's position and contentions [*Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978)]. Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the Draft Environmental Impact Statement stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement may be waived or dismissed by the courts [*City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016, 1002 (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 important that those interested in this Proposed Action participate by the close of the 45 day comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues raised by the Proposed Action, comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: David F. Alexander, Forest Supervisor, Payette

National Forest, P.O. Box 1026, 106 West Park, McCall, ID 83638.

Dated: February 8, 1995.

David F. Alexander,
Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 95-3806 Filed 2-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

Designation of Champaign for the Jinks (IL) Area

AGENCY: Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: GIPSA is designating Champaign-Danville Grain Inspection Departments, Inc. (Champaign), to provide Class X and Class Y weighing services under the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended (Act), in the former Jinks Grain Weighing Service (Jinks) geographic area.

EFFECTIVE DATES: March 1, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Janet M. Hart, Chief, Review Branch, Compliance Division, GIPSA, USDA, Room 1647 South Building, P.O. Box 96454, Washington, DC 20090-6454.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Janet M Hart, telephone 202-720-8525

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This action has been reviewed and determined not to be a rule or regulation as defined in Executive Order 12866 and Departmental Regulation 1512-1; therefore, the Executive Order and Departmental Regulation do not apply to this action.

In the October 31, 1994, **Federal Register** (59 FR 54427), GIPSA asked persons interested in providing official services in the geographic area assigned to Jinks to submit an application for designation. Applications were due by September 30, 1994. Jinks, the only applicant, applied for designation in the entire area they are currently assigned.

GIPSA requested comments on the applicant in the January 3, 1995, **Federal Register** (60 FR 96). Comments were due by January 31, 1995. GIPSA received no comments by the deadline.

GIPSA evaluated all available information regarding the designation criteria in Section 7(f)(1)(A) of the Act and determined that Jinks is not able to provide official weighing services in the geographic area for which they applied.

Section 7A(c)(2) of the Act authorizes GIPSA's administrator to designate authority to perform official weighing to an agency providing official inspection services within a specified geographic