

codes of practice, and other guidelines developed by its committees, and by promoting their adoption and implementation by governments, Codex seeks to ensure that the world's food supply is sound, wholesome, free from adulteration, and informatively labeled. In the United States, USDA, FDA, and EPA coordinate the domestic agenda of U.S. Codex as the U.S. representative to the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Commission meets biennially. The Executive Committee serves as the executive organ of Codex between meetings of the Commission.

#### Issues to be Discussed at the Meeting

The following specific agenda items for the Commission will be discussed during the public meeting on June 4, 1997:

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Election of officers of the Commission and appointment of regional coordinators.
3. Report by the chairperson on the forty-third and forty-fourth sessions of the Executive Committee.
4. Reports by coordinators on regional activities.
5. Report on the financial situation of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme for 1996/97 and 1998/99.
6. Consideration of amendments to the procedural manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.
7. Consideration of draft standards and related texts.
8. Consideration of proposals to elaborate new standards and or related texts and other matters arising from reports of Codex Committees.
9. Involvement of non-governmental organizations in the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.
10. The application of risk analysis principles in Codex.
11. Matters relating to the implementation of the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures and the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade.
12. Consideration of the draft medium-term plan for 1998 to 2002.
13. Designation of host governments for Codex Committees.
14. Other business.
15. Adoption of report.

Work of the Executive Committee relates to the same matters that will be deliberated by the Commission. This work will also be discussed in the June 4, 1997, meeting. Draft U.S. positions on agenda items in these Codex sessions will be available at the June 4, 1997 meeting.

Done at Washington, DC on: May 28, 1997.  
**Thomas J. Billy,**  
*Administrator.*  
 [FR Doc. 97-14312 Filed 5-28-97; 3:44 pm]  
 BILLING CODE 3410-DM-P

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Giant Multi-Resource Management Project, Placer County, CA

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

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

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for proposed timber harvest, plantation thinning, wildlife habitat improvement projects, creation of an interpretive trail, planting riparian vegetation, closing of dispersed camping sites, decommissioning of roads, creation of scenic overlooks, and seasonal road closures for wildlife protection within the North Shitrtail Canyon watershed in accordance with the requirements of 36 CFR 219.19. It is located in all or part of section 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, and 18, TSN, R11E and portions of sections 12, 13, and 24, T15N, R10E, Placer County, MDM, CA. The agency invites comments and suggestions on the scope of the analysis. In addition, the agency gives notice of the full environmental analysis and decision-making process that will occur on the proposal so that interested and affected people are aware of how they may participate and contribute to the final decision.

**DATES:** Comments should be made in writing and received by June 23, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments concerning the project should be directed to Rich Johnson, District Ranger, Foresthill Ranger District, 22830 Foresthill Road, Foresthill CA 95631.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Bradford, Environmental Coordinator, Foresthill Ranger District, Foresthill, CA 95631, telephone (916) 478-6254.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Giant Analysis Area is located in the North Shitrtail Canyon watershed. It lies primarily east of Sugar Pine Reservoir, west of Humbug Canyon, north of Big Reservoir, and south of the North Fork American River.

In preparing the environmental impact statement, the Forest Service will identify and analyze a range of alternatives that address the issues developed for this area. One of the

alternatives will be no treatment. Another alternative will implement all of the actions being proposed. It also means that the needs of people and environmental values will be considered in a such way that this area will represent a diverse, healthy, productive, and sustainable ecosystem.

The proposed actions include:

(1) Commercial timber harvesting on approximately 1100 acres of plantations and natural stands.

(2) Creation of two scenic overlooks, one near Sugar Pine Reservoir and one near the North Fork American River.

(3) Wildlife habitat improvement through thinning of black oak clumps and through burning or masticating of shrubfields.

(4) Closing six dispersed camping sites to restore riparian habitat and restore potential red-legged frog habitat.

(5) Protect deer winter range by installing gates and implementing a seasonal road closure.

(6) Restore native riparian vegetation in conifer plantations through planting riparian species.

(7) Establish a 1/4 mile long interpretive trail along North Shitrtail Canyon.

(8) Precommercial thin in conifer plantations using chain saw and track-laying masticating machines on approximately 580 acres.

(9) Prune plantation trees on approximately 350 acres. Public participation will be important during the analysis, especially during the review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Forest Service is seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State, and local agencies and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in or affected by the proposed action. This input will be used in preparation of the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS). The scoping process includes:

1. Identifying potential issues.
2. Identifying issues to be analyzed in depth.

3. Eliminating insignificant issues or those which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental analysis.

4. Exploring additional alternatives.

5. Identifying potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternatives (i.e., direct, indirect, and cumulative effects and connected actions).

The following list of issues has been identified through initial scoping:

- (1) to what extent will harvesting affect water quality?
- (2) What affect will timber harvesting have on the Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) trail system in the project area?

(3) To what extent can forest health be improved within the project area? In addition, what level of timber commodities could result from forest health improvement projects?

(4) To what extent will the view from Sugar Pine Reservoir be affected? What will the visual character be resulting from the proposed activities?

(5) What affect will the proposed activities have on long-term soil productivity?

(6) to what extent will air quality in the Sacramento Valley be affected by proposed activities?

(7) What affect will including harvest of <10" diameter trees have on the potential to sell harvested trees in a commercial timber sale?

Comments from other Federal, State, and local agencies, organizations, and individuals who may be interested in, or affected by the decision, are encouraged to identify other significant issues. Public participation will be solicited through mailing letters to potentially interested or affected mining claim owners, private land owners, and special use permittees on the Foresthill Ranger District; posting information in local towns; and mailing letters to local timber industries, politicians, school boards, county supervisors, and environmental groups. Continued participation will be emphasized through individual contacts. Public meetings used as a method of public involvement during preparation and review of the draft environmental impact statement will be announced in newspapers of general circulation in the geographic area of such meetings well in advance of scheduled dates.

The comment period on the draft EIS 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 EIS stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final EIS may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980).

Because of the court rulings, it is very 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 them and respond to them in the final EIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft EIS should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft EIS. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft EIS 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.

The draft EIS is expected to be available for public review by the end of July, 1997. The final EIS is expected to be available by the end of September, 1997.

The responsible official is John H. Skinner, Forest Supervisor, Tahoe National Forest, PO Box 6003, Nevada City, CA 95959.

Dated: May 16, 1997.

**John H. Skinner,**  
Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 97-14231 Filed 5-30-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

#### Opportunity for Designation in the Fostoria (OH), Pocatello (ID), Lewiston (ID), and Utah Areas

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Grain Standards Act, as amended (Act), provides that official agency designations will end not later than triennially and may be renewed. The designations of Fostoria Grain Inspection, Inc. (Fostoria), Idaho Grain Inspection Service, Inc. (Pocatello), Lewiston Grain Inspection Service, Inc. (Lewiston), and the Utah Department of Agriculture will end November 30, 1997, according to the Act. GIPSA is asking persons interested in providing official services in the Fostoria,

Pocatello, Lewiston, and Utah areas to submit an application for designation.

**DATES:** Applications must be postmarked or sent by telecopier (FAX) on or before July 1, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Applications must be submitted to USDA, GIPSA, Janet M. Hart, Chief, Review Branch, Compliance Division, STOP 3604, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20250-3604. Applications may be submitted by FAX on 202-690-2755. If an application is submitted by FAX, GIPSA reserves the right to request an original application. All applications will be made available for public inspection at this address located at 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., during regular business hours.

**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.

Section 7(f)(1) of the Act authorizes GIPSA's Administrator to designate a qualified applicant to provide official services in a specified area after determining that the applicant is better able than any other applicant to provide such official services. GIPSA designated Fostoria, main office located in Fostoria, Ohio; Pocatello, main office located in Pocatello, Idaho; Lewiston, main office located in Lewiston, Idaho; and Utah, main office located in Ogden, Utah, to provide official inspection services under the Act on December 1, 1994.

Section 7(g)(1) of the Act provides that designations of official agencies shall end not later than triennially and may be renewed according to the criteria and procedures prescribed in Section 7(f) of the Act. The designations of Fostoria, Pocatello, Lewiston, and Utah end on November 30, 1997, according to the Act.

Pursuant to Section 7(f)(2) of the Act, the following geographic area, in the State of Ohio, is assigned to Fostoria.

Bounded on the North by the northern and eastern Fulton County lines; the eastern Henry County line; the northern and eastern Wood County lines; the northern Sandusky County line east to State Route 590;

Bounded on the East by State Route 590 south to Seneca County; the northern Seneca County line east to State Route 53; State Route 53 south to Wyandot County; the northern Wyandot County line; the northern Crawford