

Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 61, No. 50

Wednesday, March 13, 1996

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

[SD-96-0001]

Plant Variety Protection Advisory Board; Meeting

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of a forthcoming meeting of the Plant Variety Protection Advisory Board. The Plant Variety Protection Advisory Board will hold an open meeting to discuss publication of the final regulations and rules of practice under the Plant Variety Protection Act (amended 1994), coverage of F1 hybrids under the Act, and other related topics. Comments may be submitted before, at, or after the meeting to the contact person listed below.

DATES: Thursday, March 28, 1996, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., open to the public.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in the National Agricultural Library Building, Conference Room 1400 (Fourteenth Floor), Beltsville, Maryland.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Commissioner Marsha A. Stanton, Plant Variety Protection Office, Room 500, National Agricultural Library Building, Beltsville, Maryland 20705 (301/504-5518).

Dated: March 11, 1996.

Lon Hatamiya,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96-6136 Filed 3-12-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-M

Noxious Weed Management

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of availability of final policy.

SUMMARY: The Forest Service gives notice of adoption of a final policy for noxious weed management in accordance with the 1990 Farm Bill amendments to the 1974 Noxious Weed Act. The final policy sets forth new direction to Forest Service personnel on the management for control of noxious weeds and undesirable plants on National Forest System lands, clarifies responsibilities and authorities for noxious weed management, and provides for an integrated weed management approach. The intended effect is to implement an integrated management approach which includes cooperation, education, prevention, treatment, containment, and control measures for noxious weed and undesirable plant infestations on National Forest System lands.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This policy, issued as Amendment 2000-95-5 to Chapter 2080 of the Forest Service Manual, was effective November 29, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions about this policy should be addressed to Deborah Hayes, Range Management Staff, Forest Service, USDA, P.O. Box 96090, Washington, DC 20090-6090 or telephone (202) 205-1460.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Expansion of noxious weed infestation increasingly threatens susceptible land and water and can adversely affect food production, wilderness values, wildlife habitat, visual quality, forage production, reforestation, recreation opportunities, and land values.

In November 1990, in section 1453 of the 1990 Farm Bill (7 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), Congress amended section 15 of the 1974 Noxious Weed Act to strengthen USDA's noxious weed management efforts. Pursuant to the 1990 amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture is to develop and coordinate a management program on National Forest System lands for control of noxious weeds and undesirable plants which are harmful, injurious, poisonous, or toxic, to establish and adequately fund the program; to complete and implement cooperative agreements regarding the management of noxious weeds on National Forest System lands; and to establish an integrated weed management approach

to control or contain species identified and targeted under cooperative agreements and/or memorandums of understanding.

Additionally, the act authorizes the Forest Service to cooperate with State, county, and other Federal agencies in the application and enforcement of all laws and regulations relating to the management and control of noxious weeds.

In response to the 1990 Farm Bill, the Forest Service issued Interim Directive (ID) 2080-92-1 to Forest Service Manual Chapter 2080, Noxious Weed Management on August 3, 1992. Notice of this ID, with a request for public comment, was published in the Federal Register at 58 FR 6429. This ID expired February 3, 1994.

On February 18, 1994, the Forest Service reissued Interim Directive 2080-92-1 as Interim Directive (ID) 2080-94-1. This ID expired August 18, 1995. As a matter of agency directive system policy, the direction could not be reissued as interim direction again. Therefore, on August 31, 1995, the Forest Service issued Amendment 2000-95-3 to Forest Service Manual Chapter 2080, Noxious Weed Management, which kept the direction in force until a final revised policy, based on consideration of comments received from the public, could be issued.

The final noxious weed management policy, Amendment 2000-95-5, issued on November 29, 1995, reflects careful consideration of comments received. The direction requires an Integrated Weed Management approach to meet vegetation management goals documented in Forest Land and Resource Management plans. Stated goals are to prevent the introduction and establishment of new noxious weed infestations; to contain and suppress existing noxious weed infestations; and to cooperate with State and local agencies, local landowners, weed control districts and boards, and other Federal agencies in management and control of noxious weeds. The noxious weed management program provides an opportunity for employees, users of National Forest System lands, adjacent landowners, and State agencies to increase their knowledge about noxious weed threats to native plant communities and ecosystems. Single copies of Forest Service Amendment

2000-95-5 may be obtained by contacting the Range Management Staff at the address listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Summary of Comments Received

In response to ID 2080-92-1, published in this Federal Register on December 6, 1993, with request for comment, 18 people submitted written comments. Of the 18 letters, 6 were from Federal agencies, 1 was from a State department of transportation, 3 were from State departments of agriculture, 2 were from weed management associations, 1 was from a native plant society, 1 was from a professional society, 1 was from a weed advisory council, and 3 were from individuals. This respondents represented the District of Columbia and nine States: Nevada, Florida, Maryland, Colorado, South Dakota, California, Oregon, New York, and Idaho.

The respondents broadly supported the overall policy direction for the noxious weeds management program. Comments dealt with funding, line officer responsibilities, program staffing, training, proposed weed classification system, definitions, flexibility for the local level, types of materials covered by closures, and activities that spread noxious weeds.

A summary of specific comments were received and organized by broad subject area, and the agency's response follows:

1. Comments: Objectives. Section 2080.2 of ID 2080-92-1 set out several noxious weed management objectives. Paragraph 2 of that section stated that one objective was to "Prevent the introduction and establishment of new noxious weed infestations." One respondent thought it important to prevent the introduction of noxious weeds, but that this was not part of a management program. Furthermore, this respondent stated that the prevention of the introduction and establishment of noxious weeds is of critical importance to all lands in the United States, not just to Forest Service lands. Since the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) has this broad responsibility, this respondent was unsure how the Forest Service could coordinate this activity purely in relation to Federal lands under Forest Service jurisdiction.

Response: As defined in the Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974 (7 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) as integrated weed management program includes prevention; therefore, preventing introduction of noxious weeds on National Forest System lands and from National Forest System lands to other

lands is considered a vital part of ongoing management and is appropriately addressed in a Forest Service directive. This directive applies only to management of noxious weeds in relation to management of National Forest System lands and does not usurp any role or authority of the Animal and Plant and Health Inspection Service. Therefore, the prevention objectives were retained in the final policy.

2. Comments: Policy. Section 2080.3 of ID 2080-92-1 establishes a policy to "Develop, coordinate, and allocate adequate funds, to the extent funds are made available, for a noxious weed management program for NFS lands * * *." One respondent suggested deleting the words, "to the extent funds are available," on the grounds that these words created the impression that the Noxious Weed Management program might be inadequately funded. Additionally, two respondents suggested including, as part of the final directive, the South Dakota Guidelines for coordinated management of noxious weeds. Another respondent recommended including words in the policy section that emphasize biodiversity.

Response: The agency has reworded the "to the extent funds are available" statement to be more positive, that is to "Establish and adequately fund the program." The agency did consider the recommendation to include South Dakota Guidelines for the coordinated management of noxious weeds as part of its final policy statement and determined that guidelines of this type are appropriate to technical handbooks and thus, under agency directive system policy cannot be issued as Manual direction. In response to the recommendation to emphasize biodiversity, this goal is addressed by other agency policies and through the forest planning process. Therefore, this recommendation was not adopted.

3. Comments: Scale of Planning. Two respondents felt that in order for effective exotic-invader control to occur, it is imperative for the agency to develop a plan on an ecosystem-wide basis that would include "* * * long term inter-agency and inter-jurisdictional strategic planning, inventory, agency and public education, conventional and innovative control procedures as well as long term commitment * * *."

Response: By law, the Forest Service must prepare land and resource management plans on a forest unit basis. Also, this agency engages in assessments and inventories at multiple scales, including ecoregional assessments and involves its Federal

and State partners in these efforts. The final policy includes language that allows and promotes planning in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, county and local governments, and individuals; supports education and sharing of information; and considers multiple techniques for control and noxious weeds.

4. Comments: Project-level Analysis and Management. Paragraph 3 of section 2080.32, Project-level Analysis and Management, of ID 2080-92-1 stated that the agency personnel must "Ensure that environmental controls and objectives are met for threatened and endangered or other species, as specified in applicable laws, policy, and regulations for project-level actions, as provided in the NEPA process." One respondent believed this implied that consideration for endangered species took priority over other activities when planning for the management of noxious weeds. While this respondent thought that endangered species, in general, needed to be protected, this reviewer also thought endangered species in a very small area may need to be sacrificed in order to avoid the spread of a noxious weed infestation to multi-millions of acres. Another person stated that the Noxious Weed Management policy contained no references to coordination with existing Forest Service policy on threatened and endangered species.

Response: Compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA) takes priority over the 1974 Noxious Weed Act. Coordination of the noxious weed management activities with existing threatened and endangered species policy is addressed under Prevention and Control Measures in section 2081.2 of the final policy; however, section 2080.32 of ID 2080-92-1 was not retained in the final policy, because project level planning is adequately addressed in the Forest Planning section or in other applicable agency directives.

5. Comment: Prevention and Control Measures. Section 2080.33 in ID 2080-92-1 set out methods and approaches for prevention, control, and management of the spread of noxious weeds. One respondent indicated that the activity of prevention and control was the responsibility of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), not of the Forest Service.

Response: The respondent's statement that prevention and control is the responsibility of APHIS is correct as far as introduction of new species into the United States is concerned. However, when new invaders threaten National Forest System lands, the Forest Service is authorized to cooperate with local

prevention and control efforts on a State-by-State or county-by-county basis, under Departmental Regulation 9500-10 issued January 18, 1990, and under final policy 2000-95-5, section 2080.2, which states, "To use an integrated weed management approach to control and contain the spread of noxious weeds on National Forest System lands and from National Forest System lands to adjacent lands."

6. Comment: Mandatory Compliance With State Law. Paragraph 3 in section 2080.33 of the ID stated that "Where States have enacted legislation and have an active program to make weed-free forage available, forest officers should issue orders restricting the transport of feed, hay, straw, or mulch that is not declared weed-free," as provided in 36 CFR Parts 261.50(a) and 261.58(t). Some reviewers recommended changing the directive word "should issue" to "shall issue," requiring mandatory compliance by agency officials, because weed-free hay, feed, mulch, and straw programs are powerful preventive measures and could save the Forest Service and taxpayers substantial money.

Response: As to the suggested word change from "should" to "shall," the agency agrees and has adopted this recommended change to require mandatory compliance with State laws restricting transport of materials stated which are not declared weed-free.

7. Comment: List of Weed-free Materials. Another respondent recommended that the Prevention and Control Measures section include soils, mulches, borrow materials, and sod in the list of materials that are required to be weed-free.

Response: Many, but not all, of the items recommended for inclusion in the final policy are listed in section 2081 Management of Noxious Weeds of the final policy. However, the agency is not precluded from taking action to prevent the introduction of weeds through any source.

8. Comment: Expanding Prevention and Control Measures. One respondent questioned how weed-free hay could be regulated, how the program would be implemented, and whether it applies to livestock. Three respondents recommended addressing prevention and control measures as they pertain to other uses such as recreational activities on the National Forest System by adding references to recreationists, sports persons, and other forest visitors.

Response: The agency agrees with the suggestion that direction should address prevention and control of the spread of noxious weeds from recreational and other activities. Pursuant to 36 CFR part 261, Subpart B, the Forest Service may

issue orders prohibiting the possession, storage, and transportation of plants or parts of plants, which may cause introduction of noxious weeds onto National Forest System lands. Therefore, the agency may restrict use, such as livestock grazing and recreational activities, that effectuate the introduction of noxious weeds.

9. Comment: Cooperation. Section 2080.34 of ID 2080-92-1 set out criteria for cooperative agreements between the Forest Service and other Federal and State agencies and County and local governments, as well as the Forest Service and individuals. Paragraph 2 in this section addressed "cooperative research that defines the ecological requirements of noxious weeds, cost-effective management strategies, and beneficial uses." One respondent asked if the term "beneficial uses" referred to beneficial uses of weeds or to the beneficial use of the land occupied by the weeds. Another respondent commented on Paragraph 3.c. of this section that referred to "Research and using desirable plant species that are competitive with noxious weeds." The respondent said this statement does not define "desirable plant."

Response: The agency believes that the text makes clear that the term "beneficial uses" refers solely to beneficial uses of weeds. Therefore, no changes were made. In reference to the comment on "desirable plants," the definition of "desirable plant" varies, since desirability depends on local ecosystem objectives. Therefore, the agency did not define desirable plant in this final policy.

10. Comment: Education and Public Awareness. One reviewer expressed concern about the introduction of noxious weeds by humans (on clothing, vehicles, all terrain vehicles, camping gear, etc.) and animals.

Response: The Forest Service is also concerned about this issue and sets out in section 2080.4 of final policy 2000-95-5 responsibilities that include development of public education programs and dissemination of information to the public about the threat of noxious weeds and potential methods of spreading them. Section 2082 of the final policy, the Cooperation section, includes direction to cooperate with other Federal, State, local and international agencies, and universities by developing educational and public awareness material and handbooks. This direction and emphasis was retained without change from that in the ID.

11. Comment: Managers' Responsibilities. Section 2080.4 of ID 2080-92-1 included the responsibility for each administrative level of the

agency to appoint a noxious weed program coordinator. One respondent recommended that the words "who is adequately trained in management of noxious weeds" be inserted to require the appointment of adequately trained managers as specified in Section 15 of the Federal Noxious Weed Act. Another respondent suggested that in section 2080.4 the agency should require that field programs have a fully staffed and funded weed management specialist and not assign a staff person the weed management duties as a secondary assignment.

Response: In Section 2080.4 of the final policy, Regional Foresters, Forest Supervisors, and District Rangers are assigned responsibility to appoint noxious weed program responsibilities and to provide training. The specific elements of the training program are developed and tailored to meet the Noxious Weed Management training needs of the agency. The Forest Service does not have full time noxious weed management positions in many staff areas, because there is insufficient workload to warrant a full time position. The designated officials are responsible for the completion of the work required and have the discretion to hire additional employees based upon their noxious weed management workload.

12. Comment: Definitions. Section 2080.5 of ID 2080-92-1 defined noxious weeds as "those plant species designated as noxious by Federal or State law." One respondent raised the issue that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service can not participate in programs on weed management that are listed solely on a State noxious weed list.

In this section of the ID, Integrated Weed Management was defined as "A process for managing noxious weeds that considers other resources, uses an interdisciplinary approach, and incorporates a variety of methods for prevention and control. Methods include education, preventative measures, physical or mechanical methods, biological control, chemical methods, and cultural methods such as livestock or wildlife grazing strategies which accomplish vegetation management objective."

The North American Weed Management Association (NAWMA) suggested that "Integrated Weed Management" (IWM) be defined as "Integrated Weed Management, within the context of ecosystem management, is the planning and implementation of a coordinated, ecologically-based program using all proven methods to prevent, contain, and control noxious weeds to achieve the optimum

management desired with the least possible environmental damage. IWM uses an interdisciplinary approach and incorporates a variety of methods including education, preventive measures, physical or mechanical methods, biological control agents, herbicide methods, cultural methods, and management practices such as manipulation of livestock or wildlife grazing strategies, or improving wildlife or livestock habitat."

Another respondent suggested the need for a definition of "noxious weed" that included other plants not listed by Federal or State government. One respondent stated that, by definition, indigenous plants cannot be included in the "Undesirable Plants" category.

Response: Addressing the role of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service is outside the scope of Forest Service policy.

In Section 2080.5 of the final policy, the Integrated Weed Management definition has been changed to more closely reflect the terminology in section 15 of the Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974 and now defines integrated weed management as follows:

An interdisciplinary pest management approach for selecting methods for preventing, containing, and controlling noxious weeds in coordination with other resource management activities to achieve optimum management goals and objectives. Methods include: education, preventive measures, herbicide, cultural, physical or mechanical methods, biological control agents, and general land management practices, such as manipulation of livestock or wildlife grazing strategies, that accomplish vegetation management objectives.

The definition of noxious weed has not been expanded. The agency believes the most defensible approach is to define noxious weeds as those plants species officially recognized by the legal jurisdictions in which the agency operates. Endangered species and indigenous plants are not included in the definition of "Undesirable Plants." This is consistent with section 15 of the Federal Weed Act of 1974.

13. Comment: National Weed Classification System. A respondent indicated that the description of "Class B" noxious weeds was confusing as stated in paragraph 2 in section 2081.2 of ID 2080-92-1. The description stated "Those noxious weeds that are non-native (exotic) species that are of limited distribution or are unrecorded in a region of the State but are common in other regions of the State. Class B plants receive second highest priority. Management emphasis is to contain the spread, decrease population size, and eventually eliminate the infestation

when cost effective technology is available."

Another respondent questioned whether the proposed National Noxious Weed Classification System defined in section 2080.2 of ID 2080-92-1 would be used throughout all National Forests or if each forest would have its own list. The respondent expressed concern that confusion will arise if each one uses a separate classification system.

Response: The agency agrees that a separate national classification system was confusing. Therefore, the agency has decided to use the same classification system of noxious weeds as that used by the respective State in which the National Forest System lands are located.

14. Comment: Memorandums of Understanding/Cooperative Agreements. Section 2082 of the Interim Directive 2080-92-1 set out basic criteria for Memorandums of Understanding and Cooperative Agreements. One respondent suggested modifying the wording on cooperative agreements to provide for greater flexibility at the state/regional level and have the local agreements spell out the specifics of a control program.

Response: The agency agrees and has made this change in the final policy.

Additional Changes

In addition to the changes due to comments, the agency deemed it necessary to change portions of the text to clarify the content, move and re-number sections in a different sequence, and emphasize subsections by making them sections. In the Objectives section, the first objective was deleted. Sections, Forest Planning and Prevention and Control, are now under section 2081—Management of Noxious Weeds.

The section, Project-level Analysis and Management, was deleted, because it was redundant of direction on addressing noxious weeds in Forest Land and Resources Management plans and through NEPA compliance.

The agency revised section 2080.33 of the ID, Prevention and Control Measures, to clarify how prevention and control measures are determined. Prevention and Control Measures contains the priority for work and directs that project managers ensure applicable laws, policy, regulations and planning direction be followed.

Section 2080.34 of the ID, Cooperation, is now a separate section 2082—Cooperation.

Section 2080.35 of the ID, Education and Policy Awareness, has been deleted. The responsibility for education is now addressed in 2080.4—Responsibility, where appropriate.

Section 2080.36 of the ID, Information Collection and Reporting, now section 2083—Information Collection and Reporting.

Paragraph 1 of section 2080.42, Responsibility—Regional Forester is redundant of Forest Land and Resource Management planning, therefore it was changed by removing the statement. Paragraph 4 was removed since priorities would be determined by State classification system and Forest level planning. Paragraph 4 of this section was removed, since priorities would be determined by State classification system and Forest level planning.

Paragraphs 1 and 6 of section 2080.43 of the ID, Responsibility—Forest Supervisor, was removed. Paragraph 1 referred to the statement of responsibilities for preventing and controlling noxious weeds and paragraph 6 referred to preparing noxious weed risk assessments. These are covered by the responsibilities of the District Ranger.

Section 2081.3 of the ID, Training, was deleted, because it has been placed in the appropriate section of managers' responsibilities in the final policy.

Regulatory Impact

This final policy has been reviewed under USDA procedures and Executive Order 12866 on Regulatory Planning and Review. It has been determined that this is not a significant rule. This policy will not have an annual effect of \$100 million or more on the economy nor adversely affect productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, nor State or local governments. This rule will not interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency nor raise new legal or policy issues. Finally, this action will not alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients of such programs. Accordingly, this final rule is not subject to OMB review under Executive Order 12866.

Moreover, this final policy has been considered in light of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), and it has been determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities as defined by that Act. The rule imposes no additional requirements on the affected public.

Environmental Impact

Section 31.1b of Forest Service Handbook 1909.15 (57 FR 43180; September 18, 1992) excludes from documentation in an environmental assessment or impact statement "rules,

regulations, or policies to establish Service-wide administrative procedures, program processes or instructions." Based on consideration of the comments received and the nature and scope of this policy, the Forest Service has determined that this policy falls within this category of actions and that no extraordinary circumstances exist which would require preparation of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.

Controlling Paperwork Burdens on the Public

This policy does not contain any recordkeeping or reporting requirements or other information collection requirements as defined in 5 CFR 1320 and, therefore, imposes no paperwork burden on the public. Accordingly, the review provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) and implementing regulations at 5 CFR 1320 do not apply.

Unfunded Mandates Reform

Pursuant to Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, which the President signed into law on March 22, 1995, the Department has assessed the effects of this rule on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. The noxious weed management policy directs only the work of Forest Service employees and does not compel the expenditure of \$100 million or more by any State, local, or tribal governments or anyone in the private sector. Therefore, a statement under section 202 of the act is not required.

Dated: March 7, 1996.

David M. Unger,
Associate Chief.

[FR Doc. 96-5972 Filed 3-12-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

Request for Comments on the Need for Official Services and Request for Applications for Designation to Provide Official Services in the Lubbock, Texas (TX) Region

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Amarillo Grain Exchange, Inc. (Amarillo), has asked GIPSA to amend their designation to remove the Lubbock region from their assigned geographic area. GIPSA is asking for comments on the need for official services in the Lubbock region. GIPSA also is asking persons interested in providing official

services in the Lubbock region to submit an application for designation.

DATE: Applications and comments must be postmarked or sent by telecopier (FAX) on or before April 10, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Applications and comments must be submitted to Janet M. Hart, Chief, Review Branch, Compliance Division, GIPSA, USDA, Room 1647 South Building, P.O. Box 96454, Washington, DC 20090-6454. Telecopier (FAX) users may send applications or comments to the automatic telecopier machine at 202-690-2755, attention: Janet M. Hart. If an application is submitted by telecopier, GIPSA reserves the right to request an original application. All applications and comments will be made available for public inspection at this address located at 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., 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.

Amarillo has asked GIPSA to remove the Lubbock region from their assigned geographic area. The Lubbock region consists of: Andrews, Borden, Cochran, Crosby, Dawson, Dickens, El Paso, Gaines, Garza, Hockley, Howard, Kent, Lubbock, Lynn, Martin, Mitchell, Scurry, Terry, and Yoakum Counties, Texas, and the parts of Hale and Lamb Counties, Texas, assigned to Amarillo.

Section 7(f)(1) of the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended (Act), authorizes GIPSA's Administrator, after determining that there is sufficient need for official services, to designate a qualified applicant to provide official services in a specified area after determining that the applicant is qualified and is better able than any other applicant to provide such official services. GIPSA is asking for comments on the need for official services in the Lubbock region (including volume estimates by carrier, type of service, and kind of grain). GIPSA also is asking persons interested in providing official services in the Lubbock region to submit an application for designation. The applicant selected for designation in the Lubbock region will be assigned by GIPSA's Administrator according to section 7(f)(1) of the Act.

Interested persons are hereby given an opportunity to submit comments on the need for official services in the Lubbock region, and to apply for designation to

provide official services in the Lubbock region under the provisions of Section 7(f) of the Act and section 800.196(d) of the regulations issued thereunder. Applications and other available information will be considered in determining which applicant will be designated.

Designation in the Lubbock region is for the period beginning about August 1, 1996, and not to exceed 3 years as prescribed in section 7(g)(1) of the Act. Persons wishing to apply for designation should contact the Compliance Division at the address listed above for forms and information.

Applications and other available information will be considered in determining which applicant will be designated.

AUTHORITY: Pub. L. 94-582, 90 Stat. 2867, as amended (7 U.S.C. 71 et seq.)

Dated: March 7, 1996.

Neil E. Porter,

Director, Compliance Division.

[FR Doc. 96-5934 Filed 3-12-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-EN-F

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Amendment to Notice of Public Meeting of the Louisiana Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the Louisiana Advisory Committee to the Commission announced in the Federal Register, FR Doc 96-2570, 61 FR 4624, published February 7, 1996, will convene at 6:00 p.m. and adjourn at 8:30 p.m. on March 28, 1996, at the Radisson Hotel, 4728 Constitution, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808. (This amendment is for change of location and time only.)

Persons desiring additional information, should contact Melvin L. Jenkins, director of the Central Regional Office, 913-551-1400 (TTY 913-551-1414).

Dated at Washington, DC, March 7, 1996.

Carol-Lee Hurley,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 96-5969 Filed 3-12-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335-01-M