When the use of the herbicide on the genetically modified plant would result in an increase in the residues of the herbicide in a food or feed crop for which the herbicide is currently registered, or in new residues in a crop for which the herbicide is not currently registered, establishment of a new tolerance or a revision of the existing tolerance would be required. Residue tolerances for pesticides are established by the EPA under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), as amended (21 U.S.C. 301 *et seq.*), and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) enforces tolerances set by the EPA under the FFDCA.

The FDA published a statement of policy on foods derived from new plant varieties in the **Federal Register** on May 29, 1992 (57 FR 22984–23005). The FDA statement of policy includes a discussion of the FDA's authority for ensuring food safety under the FFDCA, and provides guidance to industry on the scientific considerations associated with the development of foods derived from new plant varieties, including those plants developed through the techniques of genetic engineering. Monsanto has begun consultation with the FDA on the subject corn line.

In accordance with § 340.6(d) of the regulations, we are publishing this notice to inform the public that APHIS will accept written comments regarding the Petition for Determination of Nonregulated Status from any interested person for a period of 60 days from the date of this notice. The petition and any comments received are available for public review, and copies of the petition may be ordered (see the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice).

After the comment period closes, APHIS will review the data submitted by the petitioners, all written comments received during the comment period, and any other relevant information. Based on the available information, APHIS will furnish a response to the petitioners, either approving the petition in whole or in part, or denying the petition. APHIS will then publish a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing the regulatory status of the Monsanto/Dekalb corn line GA21 and the availability of APHIS' written decision.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 150aa–150jj, 151–167, and 1622n; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(c).

Done in Washington, DC, this 6th day of August 1997.

Terry L. Medley,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 97–21371 Filed 8–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign Agricultural Service

Assessment of Fees for Dairy Import Licenses

AGENCY: Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of the fee for dairy import licenses for the 1998 quota year.

SUMMARY: This notice announces that the fee to be charged for the 1998 tariff-rate quota year for each license issued to a person or firm by the Department of Agriculture authorizing the importation of certain dairy articles which are subject to tariff-rate quotas set forth in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) will be $170.00 per license.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 1, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard P. Warsack, Dairy Import Quota Manager, Import Policies and Programs Division, STOP 1021, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250–1021 or telephone at (202) 720–9439.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Import Licensing Regulation promulgated by the Department of Agriculture and codified at 7 CFR 6.20–6.36 provides for the issuance of licenses to import certain dairy articles which are subject to tariff-rate quotas (TRQs) set forth in the HTS. Those dairy articles may only be entered into the United States at the in-quota TRQ tariff rates by or for the account of a person or firm to whom such licenses have been issued and only in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Regulation.

Licenses are issued on a calendar year basis, and each license authorizes the license holder to import a specified quantity and type of dairy article from a specified country of origin. The use of licenses by the license holder to import dairy articles is monitored by the Dairy Import Quota Manager, Import Licensing Group, Import Policies and Programs Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Customs Service.

The Regulation at 7 CFR 6.33(a) provides that a fee will be charged for each license issued to a person or firm by the Licensing Authority in order to reimburse the Department of Agriculture for the costs of administering the licensing system under this Regulation.

The Regulation at 7 CFR 6.33(a) also provides that the Licensing Authority will announce the annual fee for each license and that such fee will be set out in a notice to be published in the **Federal Register**. Accordingly, this notice sets out the fee for the licenses to be issued for the 1998 calendar year.

The total cost to the Department of Agriculture of administering the licensing system during 1997 has been determined to be $442,538 and the estimated number of licenses expected to be issued is 2,601. Of the total cost, $276,872 represent staff and supervisory costs directly to administering the licensing system during 1997; $50,320 represents the total computer costs to monitor and issue import licenses during 1997; and $115,346 represents other miscellaneous costs, including travel, postage, publications, forms, and an ADP system contractor.

Accordingly, notice is hereby given that the fee for each license issued to a person or firm for the 1998 calendar year, in accordance with 7 CFR 6.33, will be $170.00 per license.

Issued at Washington, D.C. the 11th day of August, 1997.

Richard P. Warsack,

Licensing Authority.

[FR Doc. 97–21335 Filed 8–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–10–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Range Standards and Guidelines to Amend the Land and Resource Management Plans of the Eldorado and Tahoe National Forests

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice; intent to prepare environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The USDA Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for amendments to the Forest Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP) for the Eldorado National Forest and the Tahoe National Forest in accordance with the requirements of 36 CFR 219.19. The amendments will modify existing LRMP grazing standards and guidelines for management with the objective to maintain and improve rangeland ecosystems on both Forests.

DATES: Comments concerning the analysis should be received in writing by September 29, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Attn: RANGE AMENDMENT, c/o Susan A. Rodman, ID Team Leader, Land Management Planning, Eldorado National Forest, 100 Forni Road, Placerville, CA 95667.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan A. Rodman, Range Amendment ID Team Leader, Land Management Planning, (916) 621–5298.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The environmental impact statement will amend existing standards and guidelines for managing grazing by domestic livestock within the boundaries of the Eldorado and Tahoe National Forests in accordance with the requirements of 36 CFR 219.19, amend existing term grazing permits, and provide a framework for site-specific NEPA analysis of individual allotments.

The Eldorado and Tahoe National Forests manage livestock grazing on approximately 1,043,000 acres of public rangelands, with an average total production of 26,000 animal unit months (AUMs) of livestock grazing.

On November 10, 1994, the Regional Forester for the Pacific Southwest Region directed all Sierran Forests in the region to evaluate the range standards and guidelines (S&Gs) contained in their LRMPs, and to amend the LRMPs as to provide more appropriate standards and guidelines if needed. A review of the range S&Gs in both the Eldorado and Tahoe Forest LRMPs indicated to the supervisors of each Forest that an amendment to the Forest LRMPs is necessary to provide clear, specific and measurable S&Gs for effective ecosystem management of rangelands on the two Forests. This amendment to the LRMPs will provide direction to integrate ecosystem management with the management of livestock grazing in order to provide for the health of riparian and upland ecosystem types in conjunction with other S&Gs found in the LRMPs. The objectives of the grazing amendment to the LRMPs are to:

(1) Develop ecological goals to maintain or improve rangelands in both upland areas (out of a direct water influence zone) and riparian areas (streamside and lakeside zones, moist areas).

(2) Provide S&Gs that clarify direction of managing livestock. S&Gs will provide direction for managing livestock impacts to the major components of the ecosystem: soil, water, and vegetation.

(3) Provide direction for livestock management so that livestock use of woody riparian vegetation (including willows), threatened and endangered (T&E) species habitats, stream banks and lakeshores, aquatic species habitats, and non-T&E wildlife habitats maintains or improves those areas.

(4) Develop a repeatable process with measurable environmental indicators to determine existing ecological conditions and track changes in ecological conditions. Management direction is then based on that ecological condition and responds to the different conditions and trends in soil, water, and vegetation.

After the LRMP amendment is completed, these S&Gs will be used to determine how grazing allotments will be managed. It is expected that grazing permits on both Forests will need to be modified to implement the new S&Gs. Because the Eldorado and Tahoe National Forests are similar, amendments to LRMP standards and guidelines will be the same for both Forests. The current S&Gs will remain in effect until the amendment is complete and adopted as a result of this current process.

The Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) developed a Proposed Action based on issues gathered from members of the public, Forest Service personnel, and other agencies. The Proposed Action (PA) was released for public comment in October 1996, and the initial comment period was extended to January 10, 1997 at the request of several groups and members of the public. Based on scoping comments received on the PA, the Forest Supervisors decided to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

Preliminary issues connected with the proposal to amend LRMP grazing S&Gs identified through scoping include:

(1) Riparian areas are ecologically important and complex; environmental indicators are needed that are representative of this complexity. These indicators must be measurable and repeatable over time to enable the Forest Service to monitor and assess riparian and aquatic ecosystem health.

(2) The level of plant utilization by livestock may not maintain or improve the ecological health of the Forests' rangelands.

(3) Information gathered during monitoring to detect change may not be sensitive enough to provide the necessary information to prevent irreversible damage and to determine whether ecological health is being maintained or restored.

(4) Grazing by livestock can decrease the foraging habitat of voles needed as prey by great gray owls.

(5) Livestock grazing can decrease browse and hiding cover needed by deer along migration routes and in both fawning areas and winter ranges.

(6) Willow flycatcher nesting success can be negatively impacted by livestock grazing, movement, and bedding in willow clumps used for nesting by the willow flycatcher.

(7) Additional standards and guidelines may not be economically viable for permittees to implement, which may lead to the sale of ranchlands in the foothills for housing developments.

(8) Permittees do not want to be penalized for resource damage caused by other users.

(9) Fences are expensive to build and maintain, and they are barriers to wildlife and other forest users.

Alternatives that may be considered include continued use of the standards and guidelines adopted in the Eldorado and Tahoe Forests' LRMPS; and revised S&Gs to address vegetative species composition, woody riparian vegetation, aquatic resources, soil condition, and habitat for willow flycatcher, deer, and great grey owl. These alternatives may include management direction dependent on specific ecological indicators and measurements from those ecological indicators. Additional alternatives may also include landscape-level strategies for wildlife habitat and aquatic resources. An alternative which discontinues livestock grazing may be considered also.

The IDT is composed of personnel from both Forests with program responsibilities for range, wildlife, ecology, botany, hydrology, and aquatic resources. The IDT has been directed to develop alternatives to amend the standards and guidelines for both Forests' LRMPs.

Integration of grazing standards and guidelines with other provisions of the affected LRMPs will take place through subsequent allotment management plans required for each allotment as part of the normal LRMP implementation and monitoring process.

Written comments from the public should be submitted as indicated at the beginning of this notice. Comments would be most useful if sent by the date specified and if they clearly address the issues and alternatives related to the proposed action—amending grazing standards and guidelines for the Eldorado and Tahoe National Forests.

The comment period on the draft EIS will be 90 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**. Public meetings used as a method of public involvement during preparation and review of the draft EIS will be announced in newspapers of general circulation in the

geographic area of such meetings well in advance of scheduled dates.

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, 1022 (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 very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 90-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 environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on 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 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 responsible officials for this environmental impact statement and decision are John H. Skinner, Forest Supervisor, Tahoe National Forest, P.O. Box 6003, Nevada City, CA 95959–6003 and John Phipps, Forest Supervisor, Eldorado National Forest, 100 Forni Road, Placerville, CA 95667.

A draft environmental impact statement is expected to be available for agency and public review by November 1997, and a final environmental impact statement should be available by March 1998.

Dated: July 30, 1997.

John Phipps,

Forest Supervisor, Eldorado National Forest.

Dated: August 1, 1997.

John H. Skinner,

Forest Supervisor, Tahoe National Forest.

[FR Doc. 97–21345 Filed 8–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY: Rural Telephone Bank, USDA.

ACTION: Staff Briefing for the Board of Directors.

TIME AND DATE: 2 p.m., Thursday, August 21, 1997.

PLACE: Room 0204, South Building, Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED: General discussion involving FCC rulemaking affecting the Bank and RUS telecommunications programs; proposed budget for FY 1998; retirement of Class A stock in FY 1997; annual dividend rate for Class C stock; reserve for loan losses; conversion of Class B stock to Class C stock upon partial repayment of Bank loans; directors' liability insurance; and final rules 7 CFR parts 1610 and 1735.

Action: Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors.

Time and Date: 9 a.m., Friday, August 22, 1997.

Place; Room 104A, South Building, Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC.

Status: Open.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: The following matters have been placed on the agenda for the Board of Directors meeting:

1. Call to Order.
2. Action on Minutes of May 15, 1997, Board meeting.
3. Report on loans approved in third quarter FY 1997.
4. Report on requests for waiver of prepayment premiums in third quarter FY 1997.
5. Summary of financial activity for third quarter FY 1997.
6. Consideration of resolution to retire Class A stock in FY 1997.
7. Consideration of resolution to set annual Class C stock dividend rate.
8. Consideration of the Bank Board's annual report for FY 1996.
9. Adjournment.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Robert Peters, Assistant Governor, Rural Telephone Bank, (202) 720–9554.

Dated: August 8, 1997.

Wally Beyer,

Governor, Rural Telephone Bank.

[FR Doc. 97–21595 Filed 8–11–97; 3:58 pm]

BILLING CODE 3410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Submission For OMB Review; Comment Request

DOC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Agency: Bureau of the Census.

Title: Current Industrial Reports Program—Wave I (Mandatory).

Form Number(s): Total of 23 individual CIR reports.

Agency Approval Number: 0607–0392.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Burden: 18,252 hours.

Number of Respondents: 14,650.

Avg Hours Per Response: 1 hour 15 minutes.

Needs and Uses: The Current Industrial Reports (CIR) program is a series of monthly, quarterly, and annual surveys which provide key measures of production, shipments, and/or inventories on a national basis for selected manufactured products. Government agencies, business firms, trade associations, and private research and consulting organizations use these data to make trade policy, production, and investment decisions.

For clearance purposes, the approximately 72 CIR surveys are divided into ''waves.'' Each wave has an associated voluntary and mandatory clearance package, making 6 separate clearances. Each year, one wave (2 clearance packages) is submitted for review.

In this request, we are moving 3 CIR reports (Air Conditioning & Refrigeration; Steel Mill; and Computer and Office Equipment) from other waves into this wave because of changes in survey content and moving 3 others (Confectionery; Coin Operated Vending Machines; and Electric Lighting Fixtures) into this wave because of a change in reporting status. These 3 annual reports, normally conducted as voluntary, are being done on a mandatory basis this year in conjunction with the economic