

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

Forest Service

Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Eagle Creek Timber Sales, Mt. Hood National Forest, Clackamas County, OR

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent to supplement a draft environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The USDA, Forest Service, will prepare a supplement to the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for Eagle Creek Timber Sales on the Estacada Ranger District of the Mt. Hood National Forest. The draft EIS was released in July 1993. Following the release of the draft EIS, the Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (Northwest Forest Plan) was signed on April 13, 1994. This new direction will require changes to the alternatives in the draft EIS. The alternatives will be revised to be in compliance with the new direction and be re-analyzed as a supplement to the existing analysis.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments and questions about this supplement to the Estacada Ranger District, Mt. Hood National Forest, 595 NW Industrial Way, Estacada, Oregon 97023, Phone: (503) 630-6861.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Berry, Estacada District Ranger, Mt. Hood National Forest, Mt. Hood National Forest, 595 NW Industrial Way, Estacada, Oregon 97023, Phone: (503) 630-6861.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The original proposed action was developed in accordance with the direction contained in the Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (1991). The Northwest Forest Plan has resulted in new circumstances and

substantial changes to the original proposed action. The Northwest Forest Plan has designated this area as a Key Watershed and also allocated portions of the area to Late Successional and Riparian Reserves. Changes to the proposed action include: (1) No road building in the roadless area and no timber harvest within the Late Successional Reserve; (2) designing the harvest units consistent with the Standards and Guidelines in the Northwest Forest Plan; and (3) incorporating the results of the watershed analysis. Comments received from the draft EIS will be considered in the preparation of the supplement.

The supplement will be prepared and circulated in the same manner (exclusive of scoping) as the draft EIS (40 CFR 1502.9). The supplement to the draft EIS is expected to be available for public review and comment in February 1996. The comment period on the draft supplement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency's notice of availability appears in the Federal Register.

The Forest Service believes it is important to give reviewers notice at this early stage of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of the draft supplement to the EIS must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. versus NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also environmental objections that could be raised at the draft supplement stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final EIS may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon versus Hodel*, 803 F.2d. 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. versus Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Due to 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 EIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issue and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the supplement to the

draft EIS should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft supplement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the supplement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the supplement. (Reviewer 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).

After the 45 day comment period ends on the supplement to the draft EIS, the comments will be analyzed and considered by the Forest Service in preparing the final EIS. The final EIS is scheduled to be completed by June 1996. In the final EIS, the Forest Service is required to respond to the comments received (40 CFR 1503.4). The Responsible Official, Forest Supervisor Roberta Moltzen will consider the comments, responses, environmental consequences discussed in the final EIS, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making a decision and reasons for the decision in the Record of Decision.

That decision will meet the criteria of Section 2001(e) of Public Law 104-19 and is not appealable. This decision is subject to judicial review only in the United States court for the district of Oregon. As required under Section 2001(f)(1) of Public Law 104-19, any challenge to this project must be filed in the district court within 15 days after the advertisement of the sale.

Dated: October 5, 1995.

Roberta Moltzen,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 95-25798 Filed 10-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census

National Employers Survey II; Notice and Request for Comments

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before December 18, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Gerald Taché, Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Steven Rudolph, Economic Planning and Coordination Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233, (301) 457-2586 voice and (301) 457-4433 fax.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

In the Fall of 1994, the Census Bureau conducted the National Employers Survey for the National Center on the Employment Quality of the Workforce (EQW), a non-profit research group. This survey collected data for a regression-based econometric study on employment, hiring, training, investment, and productivity, as they relate to each other. We surveyed a representative panel of just over 3,000 domestic business establishments with 20 or more employees. This was the first attempt to measure the factors. The EQW began issuing findings from the study in February 1995 and the results generated great interest from all levels. Their first large-scale technical reports are now being issued.

Major findings included information on what attributes firms looked for when hiring new employees. They found that attitude and communications skills were highly valued by employers while grades and teachers' recommendations were not. Their analysis indicates that investment in human capital (training) had at least as big, and in many groups including services, or bigger return than investment in physical capital. These findings provide a baseline for employers, public and private, for formulating and gauging human resources decisions and policies in a manner that will provide the most effective return on productivity in the workplace.

As this was the first attempt to gather this type of data, responses in four areas were weak. This proposed follow up will address this problem by changing the intent of the original questions. In addition, as the original study was

looking at relationships between, for example, training and productivity, it would be very useful to have data for consecutive years. This proposed survey will ask for a small amount of data for the following year.

The follow-up questions fall into four categories:

Updating last year's data (questions 1-6 are examples) these are designed to test the stability of the survey's initial findings that linked productivity to education. This is the central theme of the survey and the results' usefulness will be greatly increased with an additional data period.

Providing more precise definitions of the target population (who would be candidates for training) (question 8 is an example) the original question (number 14 in the initial survey) did not provide as clear an understanding of skills required by the categories of employees. We believe this version should improve the findings.

Providing greater detail where important policy considerations are at stake (questions 17 and 18 are examples) after reviewing results from the original questions, we felt that the attributes that employers valued during hiring could have been clarified and better specified.

Testing the initial results in areas that seem anomalous to prevailing wisdom (questions 19-23 are examples) in the initial findings the utilization rate for tuition remissions was relatively low. These questions should be better tailored to the information the respondents are likely to have at hand.

By surveying the original panel respondents, we need only ask the additional questions (which should take an average of 10 to 12 minutes).

In addition to the Department of Education, which had a basic interest in the project from its inception, other governmental agencies have shown a strong interest. This includes the GAO and the Department of Labor.

II. Method of Collection

We will conduct the survey with Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) as with the initial NES. Since the respondents are familiar with the survey, they would not require additional preparation and instruction. As with the initial survey, the EQW is analyzing relationships rather than tabulating totals. For this reason we will accept and encourage the use of reasonable estimates. This allows the sponsor to use the initial data more effectively as the new data will augment and add valuable information to the original data set. We will provide all respondents (or a panel member who does not or cannot respond to the interview) who indicate they want one, with a copy of the latest findings of the surveys.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0607-0787 (for original National Employers Survey).

Form Number: Not applicable.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 3,000.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 12 minutes.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 600 hours.

Estimated Total Cost: \$125,000.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: October 12, 1995.

Gerald Taché,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 95-25806 Filed 10-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-P

International Trade Administration

Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings Nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings Nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is notifying the public of its determination not to revoke the antidumping duty order listed below.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 18, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Panfeld or the analyst listed