

setting activities of each international standard-setting organization. This responsibility has been delegated to the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) for Codex activities, and to the USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) for OIE and IPPC activities. FSIS published a notice in the Federal Register on June 4, 1996 (61 FR 28132), informing the public of sanitary and phytosanitary standard-setting activities for Codex.

Accordingly, in this notice, APHIS announces the following OIE and IPPC (including NAPPO) activities related to international standards. The United States is a participant in each of the following activities and APHIS is the agency responsible for representing the United States with respect to these standards. In some cases, working groups and committees have not yet set meeting dates and places or determined specific standards to be discussed. Also, because working groups and the issues they address are not static, this list may not present a complete picture of the OIE and IPPC sanitary and phytosanitary standard-setting activities during the coming year.

1. Committee/Working Group: Standards Commission of the OIE.

Agency Participant: Dr. James Pearson.

General Purpose: Establish standards for methods of diagnosing animal disease and testing biologics used for control programs.

Dates of Meetings: September 10–11, 1996.

Location of Meetings: Paris, France.

Major Discussion/Agenda: Review of OIE reference laboratories; diagnostic test standardization; OIE reference sera; laboratory quality assurance; review of new edition of OIE *Manual of Standards of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines*; and provide advice to OIE Animal Health Code Commission.

2. Committee/Working Group: OIE General Session.

Agency Participant(s): Dr. Joan Arnoldi (delegate); Dr. Alex Thiermann (alternate delegate and coordinator).

General Purpose: Establish and adopt international standards dealing with animal health.

Date of Meeting: May 1997.

Location of Meeting: Paris, France.

Major Discussion/Agenda: Animal health standards as they relate to trade; including risk assessment standards (including criteria for evaluating veterinary infrastructure) and regionalization.

3. Committee/Working Group: IPPC/ Foreign Agricultural Organization Working Group on Pest Risk Analysis.

Agency Participant: Mr. Richard Orr.

General Purpose: Development of international standards for pest risk analysis.

Date of Meeting: To be announced.

Location of Meeting: To be announced.

Major Discussion/Agenda: To be announced.

4. Committee/Working Group: NAPPO Biological Control Committee.

Agency Participant: Dr. Dale Meyerdirk.

General Purpose: Facilitate cooperation among NAPPO member countries regarding biological control issues, through information exchange, coordination, and harmonization of recommendations, regulations, and guidelines.

Date of Meeting: February 1997.

Location of Meeting: Mexico City, Mexico.

Major Discussion/Agenda: To develop standard guidelines for the release of exotic biological control agents for the control of weed pests.

5. Committee/Working Group: NAPPO Fruit Tree and Grapevine Nursery Stock Certification Standards Panel.

Agency Participant: Dr. Joseph Foster.

General Purpose: Set minimum standards for pathogen testing and propagation of fruit trees and grapevines so certified nursery stock can be shipped safely throughout North America.

Date of Meeting: To be announced.

Location of Meeting: Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

Major Discussion/Agenda: Pathogen lists for each crop; and certification schemes for each crop.

6. Committee/Working Group: NAPPO Working Group.

Agency Participant: Mr. Marshall Kirby.

General Purpose: Provide general leadership, direction, and support to NAPPO activities.

Dates of Meetings: October 1996; January and April 1997.

Locations of Meetings: To be announced.

Major Discussion/Agenda: All new and ongoing NAPPO business, including standards.

7. Committee/Working Group: NAPPO Ad Hoc Irradiation Panel.

Agency Participant: Mr. Robert Griffin.

General Purpose: Develop NAPPO standards for the application of irradiation to phytosanitary problems.

Date of Meeting: October 1996.

Location of Meeting: Veracruz, Mexico.

Major Discussion/Agenda: Continuing development of trilateral policy.

8. Committee/Working Group: NAPPO Pest Risk Analysis Panel.

Agency Participant: Dr. Matthew Royer.

General Purpose: To implement NAPPO pest risk analysis standard.

Date of Meeting: October 1996.

Location of Meeting: Veracruz, Mexico.

Major Discussion/Agenda: To be announced.

9. Committee/Working Group: NAPPO Executive Committee.

Agency Participant: Mr. Alfred Elder.

General Purpose: To harmonize plant quarantine regulations and import requirements among Canada, Mexico, and the United States.

Dates of Meetings: October 1996 and April 1997.

Locations of Meetings: To be announced.

Major Discussion/Agenda: Standards development process; area freedom standard; pest surveillance/monitoring standard; and pest risk analysis standard.

Comments on standards being considered or to be considered by any of the committees or working groups listed above may be sent to us as directed under the heading **ADDRESSES**.

Done in Washington, DC, this 16th day of September 1996.

Terry L. Medley,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 96–24211 Filed 9–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

Forest Service

Paradise Project, Boise National Forest, Idaho

AGENCY: Forest Services, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of Intent to Prepare Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: The Mountain Home Ranger District of the Boise National Forest will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for an integrated resource management project in the Paradise project area, located immediately west of the South Fork Boise River and approximately 2 miles south of Featherville, Idaho. Access is via Forest Development Road (FDR) 183. The project area encompasses approximately 2,800 acres of National Forest System land and is located 60 road miles northeast of Mountain Home and about 100 road miles east of Boise, Idaho.

The agency invites written comments and suggestions on the scope of the

analysis. The agency also hereby gives notice of the environmental analysis and decisionmaking 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.

Proposed Action: The proposed action would commercial thin, salvage harvest, and use prescribed fire throughout most of the project area. Helicopter, skyline, and tractor/off-road jammer (excavator) yarding would be done. Approximately 4 miles of road would be constructed and 1 mile of existing road would be reconstructed. New and existing helicopter landings would be used. Bald eagle habitat would be protected and enhanced with buffer zones and thinning. The activities would occur from 1997 to 1998.

Preliminary Issues: One significant issue with the proposed action has been identified so far. The issue is that timber harvest and associated road construction could impact the undeveloped characteristics and wilderness attributes of the Rainbow Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA).

Possible Alternatives to the Proposed Action: One alternative to the proposed action has been identified. It is the no action alternative. Other alternatives may be developed as issues are raised and information is received.

Decisions to be Made: The Boise National Forest Supervisor will decide whether to implement the project. If the project is to be implemented, the Forest Supervisor will decide which activities to include in the project, when the project should occur, and what mitigation and monitoring is needed to ensure the project is environmentally acceptable.

Schedule: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), November 1996. Final, January 1997.

Public Involvement: Scoping was initiated in October 1995. A legal notice appeared in the Idaho Statesman on October 2, 1995. A scoping letter was sent out to over 80 individuals, groups, organizations, and agencies. Comments receive from these public involvement efforts will be incorporated into the analysis process.

Comments: Written comments concerning the proposed project and analysis are encouraged and should be postmarked within 30 days following publication of this announcement in the Federal Register. Mail comments to Frank Marsh, Mountain Home Ranger District, 2180 American Legion Boulevard, Mountain Home, ID 83647; telephone 208-587-7961 or 208-364-4310. Further information can be obtained at the same location.

The comment period on the DEIS 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 DEIS's 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 DEIS stage but 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 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 environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the DEIS 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 DEIS 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 D. Rittenhouse, Forest Supervisor, Boise National Forest, 1750 Front Street, Boise, ID 83702.

Dated: September 16, 1996.
Cathy Barbouletos,
Deputy Forest Supervisor.
[FR Doc. 96-24142 Filed 9-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

Procurement List Additions

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

ACTION: Additions to the Procurement List.

SUMMARY: This action adds to the Procurement List services to be furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 21, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, Crystal Square 3, Suite 403, 1735 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202-3461.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Beverly Milkman (703) 603-7740.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 26, 1996, the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled published notice (61 F.R. 39118) of proposed additions to the Procurement List. After consideration of the material presented to it concerning capability of qualified nonprofit agencies to provide the services and impact of the additions on the current or most recent contractors, the Committee has determined that the services listed below are suitable for procurement by the Federal Government under 41 U.S.C. 46-48c and 41 CFR 51-2.4.

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities other than the small organizations that will furnish the services to the Government.
2. The action will not have a severe economic impact on current contractors for the services.
3. The action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the services to the Government.
4. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46-48c) in connection with the services proposed for addition to the Procurement List.

Accordingly, the following services are hereby added to the Procurement List: