Environmental Policy Act, and the Administrative Procedures Act. The lead plaintiffs were the Sierra Club and the Wilderness Society, representing nine co-plaintiffs. A Settlement Agreement was signed on September 13, 1993 and the U.S. District Court has issued an order directing implementation of the Settlement Agreement.

The key component of the Settlement Agreement was a commitment by the Forest Service to begin the process of revising the Clearwater Forest Plan within 18 months of the settlement agreement being signed to provide longterm resolution between the parties. The settlement agreement was signed on September 13, 1993.

The Settlement Agreement also states that the current Forest Plan will remain in effect during the revision process but implementation would be modified using four interim measures. These interim measures provide additional direction related to the implementation of projects and activities in certain roadless areas, timber harvest, old growth and water quality.

Following the settlement agreement, the Clearwater National Forest began gathering background information necessary to begin the revision process. However, since September 1993, several other related Forest Service planning efforts have been initiated that involve the Clearwater National Forest. Most notable is the "Upper Columbia River Basin, Environmental Impact Statement" (UCRB), which will address issues relevant to the Clearwater National Forest and likely result in changes to Forest Plans in the UCRB. Notice of this effort and supporting information was previously published in the Federal Register on December 4, 1994.

The purpose of the Upper Columbia River Basin, EIS is to ''\* \* \* develop and analyze a scientifically sound, ecosystem-based strategy for management of lands administered by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. \* \* The strategy will modify existing Forest Plans and will focus on forest, rangeland, and aquatic/riparian ecosystem health and the sustainability of threatened, endangered, and sensitive species." Clearly this effort will have a profound influence on the revision process for the Clearwater National Forest. Therefore, the revision schedule for the Clearwater National Forest is designed to coordinate with the information and decisions produced by the UCRB, EIS. As part of the revision schedule separate notices will go out for scoping, comments on the DEIS, and comments on the FEIS.

During the next 12–18 months, while the UCRB, EIS is in preparation, the Clearwater National Forest will continue to gather data and information, and conduct assessments of resource conditions to better frame the revision process. Tribal governments, state or federal agencies or the public are invited to send comments regarding their ideas concerning information or data that the Clearwater National Forest can be gathering and assessing during this 12–18 month period.

DATES: Comments concerning resource assessments or data gathering in support of the Clearwater Forest Plan revision, should be received in writing by 90 days following the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. A supplemental notice will be placed in the **Federal Register** announcing the beginning of formal scoping for the DEIS with an opportunity to comment following completion of the UCRB, EIS.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments concerning this proposal to James L. Caswell, Forest Supervisor, Clearwater National Forest, 12730 US Highway 12, Orofino, Idaho 83544.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Doug Gochnour, Forest Planning Staff Officer or Harry Jageman, Acting Revision Team Leader, 12730 US Highway 12, Orofino, Idaho 83544, phone (208) 476–4541.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Preliminary tasks that have been identified for assessment and data gathering include: Land type descriptions, social/economic, old growth, watersheds, recreation, forest health and fire history. In general, these assessments will be conducted at a smaller, more localized scale than will occur for the entire UCRB.

Revision scoping meetings are tentatively planned for Moscow, Lewiston, Orofino, and Kooskia, in Idaho and Missoula Montana. Specific dates, times and locations will be announced in local newspapers of general distribution. These scoping meetings will begin following the completion of the UCRB, EIS presently scheduled for summer, 1996. The projected dates for the DEIS and FEIS will be posted in the **Federal Register** at a later date.

The alternatives considered in the revision of the Clearwater Forest Plan will be consistent with decisions made in the UCRB, EIS. The purpose and need, preliminary issues, and the scope of the Clearwater Forest Plan revision, will be further described in a separate **Federal Register** notice at a later date. The responsible official for the revision of the Clearwater Forest Plan will be the Regional Forester, Northern Region, P.O. Box 7669, Missoula, Montana.

## David F. Jolly,

Regional Forester.

[FR Doc. 95–5567 Filed 3–7–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## [Order No. 730]

## Foreign-Trade Zones Board; Approval of Export Processing Activity; Upstate Precision Mfg., Inc. (Office Furniture Systems) Within Foreign-Trade Zone 54, Clinton County, NY

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, § 400.28(a)(2) of the Board's regulations, requires approval of the Board prior to commencement of new manufacturing/processing activity within existing zone facilities;

Whereas, the Clinton County Area Development Corporation, grantee of FTZ 54, Clinton County, New York, has requested authority under § 400.32(b)(1) of the Board's regulations on behalf of Upstate Precision Mfg., Inc. (UPMI), to manufacture modular furniture panels for export within FTZ 54 (filed 11–23– 94, FTZ Docket A(32b1)–4–94; Doc. 7– 95, assigned 2/21/95);

Whereas, pursuant to § 400.32(b)(1), the Commerce Department's Assistant Secretary for Import Administration has the authority to act for the Board in making such decisions on new manufacturing/processing activity under certain circumstances, including situations where the proposed activity is for export only (§ 400.32(b)(1)(ii); and,

Whereas, the FTZ Staff has reviewed the proposal, taking into account the criteria of § 400.31, and the Executive Secretary has recommended approval;

Now, Therefore, the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, acting for the Board pursuant to § 400.32(b)(1), concurs in the recommendation and hereby approves the request subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28, and subject to the further condition that all textile products admitted to the zone for UPMI shall be of U.S. origin or shall be a good originating in the territory of a NAFTA country (Sec. 202, PL 103– 182, 12–8–93).