advance of the renewal date of the agreement.

A review of the revenue collected for application and inspection fees and contract fees indicates that the fees collected are insufficient to meet costs incurred by CCC for warehouse examinations and contract origination administrative functions. Accordingly, beginning with the 1995–96 contract year, the fees are changed by increasing by 30 percent those fees applicable to the 1994–95 contract year.

Determination

The fees set forth herein will be collected by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) from non-Federally licensed warehouse operators in States which do not have a Cooperative Agreement with CCC for warehouse examination services and who have entered into a storage agreement with CCC or who are seeking to enter into a storage agreement with CCC.

Application and Inspection Fees

The fee will be computed at the rate of \$13 for each 10,000 bushels of storage capacity or fraction thereof, but the fee will be not less than \$130 nor more than \$1,300.

Contract Fees

The contract fee will be collected by CCC from warehouse operators who have entered into or will enter into a storage agreement with CCC but who do not have a Federal warehouse license or a State warehouse license issued by a State having a Cooperative Agreement with CCC for warehouse examination services.

TWELVE-MONTH CONTRACT FEE SCHEDULE

Location capacity (bushels)	Contract fees (dollars)
1 to 150,000	\$130
150,001 to 250,000	260
250,001 to 500,000	390
500,001 to 750,000	520
750,001 to 1,000,000	650
1,000,001 to 1,200,000	780
1,200,001 to 1,500,000	910
1,500,001 to 2,000,000	1,040
2,000,001 to 2,500,000	1,170
2,500,001 to 5,000,000	1,300
5,000,001 to 7,500,000	1,430
7,500,001 to 10,000,000	1,560
10,000,001 +	¹ 1,560

¹ Plus \$40 per million bushels above 10,000,000 or fraction thereof.

Signed at Washington, D.C. on March 3, 1995.

Bruce R. Weber,

Acting Executive Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation.
[FR Doc. 95–5994 Filed 3–9–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410–05–P

Forest Service

Pilot Creek Environmental Impact Statement, Six Rivers National Forest, Humboldt County, CA; Revised Notice of Intent

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Revised Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: The Forest Service published a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an **Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)** in the Federal Register (56 FR 3068) on January 15, 1991 for the proposed timber management project in the Pilot and Torrey Compartments of the Mad River Ranger District. The draft EIS was delayed due to a change in project objectives. A revised NOI was published in the Federal Register (57 FR 30715) on June 19, 1992. The objectives of the project were modified to implement a strategy that would accelerate the development of late seral habitat characteristics and result in timber production. The draft EIS was expected to be available for public review in June 1993. The draft EIS was delayed due to anticipated changes resulting from President Clinton's Forest Conference held in April of 1993.

As a result of the Forest Conference, The Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (ROD) was signed on April 13, 1994. Subsequently, as required by the ROD, a Watershed Analysis for the Pilot Creek watershed was developed. Survey protocol requirements were also completed for marbled murrelet within the Pilot Creek project area.

The objectives of the Pilot Creek project have been modified to bring the project in line with ecosystem management concepts and to be consistent with direction contained within the ROD and the Six Rivers National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP), scheduled for implementation April 1995.

The revised project objectives are to:

1. Maintain existing late seral conifer stands.

- 2. Accelerate the development of late seral characteristics within conifer stands.
- 3. Restore currently degraded conditions which pose risks to riparian and aquatic ecosystems.
- 4. Maintain or enhance oak woodland
- 5. Reduce the risk of catastrophic loss due to wildfire.
- 6. Contribute to the short-term demand for timber and the socio-economic well-being of local communities.

Substantial scoping has been conducted on this project and includes public meetings, written correspondence, field trips and one-on-one discussions. The driving issues that were used to develop project alternatives focused on water quality and the released roadless area. Five alternatives were developed that will be redesigned to incorporate the expanded objectives and brought into consistency with the ROD and LRMP.

The project area has been expanded to encompass the entire Pilot Creek watershed and now covers 25,442 acres. The project area is within the Hayfork Adaptive Management Area which, as described in the ROD, is designed for the development, testing, and application of forest management practices.

The draft EIS is now expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and available for public review in June 1995. At that time the EPA will publish a notice of availability of the draft EIS in the **Federal Register**. The final EIS is now scheduled to be completed in November 1995.

The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the EPA's Notice of Availability appears 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 a Draft EIS 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 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 these court rulings, it is very