

TABLE 2. — REGISTRANTS REQUESTING VOLUNTARY CANCELLATION

EPA Company No.	Company Name and Address
000270	Farnam Companies Inc., 301 W. Osborn Rd., Phoenix, AZ 85067.
000352	E.I. Du Pont Denemours & Co., Inc., Agricultural Products Department, Box 80038, Wilmington, DE 19880.
000400	Uniroyal Chemical Co. Inc., 74 Amity Rd., Bethany, CT 06524.
000464	The Dow Chemical Co., Reg. Compliance / Health & Environmental, 1803 Building, Midland, MI 48674.
000746	Imperial Inc., Agent For: MFA Oil Co., Box 98, Shenandoah, IA 51601.
001022	Chapman Chemical Co., Box 9158, Memphis, TN 38109.
001471	Elanco Products Co., Box 708, Greenfield, IN 46140.
002781	Happy Jack Inc., Box 475, Snow Hill, NC 28580.
004758	Pet Chemicals, Box 18993, Memphis, TN 38181.
006653	Goulds Dell Prod, 1318 Commerce Park Dr., Williamsport, PA 17701.
006720	Southern Mill Creek Products, 5414 North 56th Street, Tampa, FL 33610.
007173	Liphatech, Inc., 3600 W. Elm St., Milwaukee, WI 53209.
009319	Custom Chemicides, Box 11216, Fresno, CA 93772.
010182	ICI Americas Inc., Agricultural Products, New Murphy Rd. & Concord Pike, Wilmington, DE 19897.
011556	Miles Inc., Agriculture Division, Animal Health Products, Box 390, Shawnee Mission, KS 66201.
033816	T.F.G. Associates, 7518 North 13th Ave., Suite 21, Phoenix, AZ 85021.
049585	Alljack & Co., 377 Amelia, Plymouth, MI 48170.
055947	Sandoz Agro, Inc., 1300 E. Touhy Ave., Des Plaines, IL 60018.
063935	Third Party Registrations, Inc., Box 140097, Orlando, FL 32814.

III. Procedures for Withdrawal of Request

Registrants who choose to withdraw a request for cancellation must submit such withdrawal in writing to James A. Hollins, at the address given above, postmarked before September 1, 1992. This written withdrawal of the request for cancellation will apply only to the applicable 6(f)(1) request listed in this notice. If the product(s) have been subject to a previous cancellation action, the effective date of cancellation and all other provisions of any earlier cancellation action are controlling. The withdrawal request must also include a commitment to pay any reregistration fees due, and to fulfill any applicable unsatisfied data requirements.

IV. Provisions for Disposition of Existing Stocks

The effective date of cancellation will be the date of the cancellation order. The orders effecting these requested cancellations will generally permit a registrant to sell or distribute existing stocks for 1-year after the date the cancellation request was received. This policy is in accordance with the Agency's statement of policy as prescribed in Federal Register No. 123, Vol. 56, dated June 26, 1991. Exceptions to this general rule will be made if a product poses a risk concern, or is in

noncompliance with reregistration requirements, or is subject to a data call-in. In all cases, product-specific disposition dates will be given in the cancellation orders.

Existing stocks are those stocks of registered pesticide products which are currently in the United States and which have been packaged, labeled, and released for shipment prior to the effective date of the cancellation action. Unless the provisions of an earlier order apply, existing stocks already in the hands of dealers or users can be distributed, sold or used legally until they are exhausted, provided that such further sale and use comply with the EPA-approved label and labeling of the affected product(s).

Exceptions to these general rules will be made in specific cases when more stringent restrictions on sale, distribution, or use of the products or their ingredients have already been imposed, as in Special Review actions, or where the Agency has identified significant potential risk concerns associated with a particular chemical.

Dated: May 26, 1992.

Douglas D. Camp, Jr.
Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 92-12929 Filed 6-2-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

[OPP-00319; FRL-4066-4]

Notice of Availability of the Pesticide Handlers Exposure Data Base through Versar, Inc.

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: A Task Force comprised of EPA, Health and Welfare Canada (HWC), and National Agricultural Chemicals Association (NACA) has developed a generic data base that estimates exposures to mixers, loaders, and applicators of pesticides. This notice announces the availability of the Pesticide Handlers Exposure Data Base (PHED). PHED provides registrants, regulatory agencies, and the public with a substantial body of data on which to base evaluations of the potential exposures for a variety of application methods, crop types and formulations.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the PHED can be ordered from Tim Leighton, Versar Inc., 6850 Versar Center, Springfield, VA 22151, (1-800-283-7727).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John T. Tice, Health Effects Division (H7509C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 807, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Crystal City, VA, (703-305-7975).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This generic pesticide field worker exposure data base was conceived by a Task Force when it was determined that exposure to pesticide users is primarily a function of the physical parameters of handling and application (e.g., formulation type and mixing/loading/application procedures), rather than of the chemical properties of the active ingredient. The Task Force felt there were many uses and benefits to a generic data base. The most significant benefit is that it allowed exposure and risk assessments to be conducted with a greater degree of certainty, since exposure estimates were based on a larger number of observations than were available from a single exposure study. Secondly, the data base will be a useful research tool for determining and comparing the influences of different parameters on pesticide exposures. Thirdly, pesticide registrants will be able to use the data base and make risk management decisions at the product design stage, prior to the registration stage. Lastly, the cost of pesticide exposure evaluations will be reduced as data are produced for exposure scenarios.

The current version of PHED is being released to the public with the full knowledge and understanding of the Task Force that there are a number of limitations to the data base that will not be solved in this iteration. Enhancements of PHED including improvements in processing time and an increase in the number of data records in the data base, are expected to occur over the next two to three years. Furthermore, the Task Force does not expect the data base to solve all exposure estimation problems for pesticide use. More studies will need to be conducted. Also, improved methodology is critical, particularly in the area of dermal exposure monitoring. However, the availability of pesticide exposure data, organized and compiled in an accessible form in PHED, will allow decisions to be made with greater confidence and will direct future research and monitoring efforts in the most productive directions.

PHED contains over 800 data records for workers engaged in pesticide mixing/loading and application

procedures. It also contains procedures for selecting and subsetting data for specific purposes or for entering and using data from other field exposure studies. The PHED program contains the statistical capability to perform univariate (e.g., to obtain means, percentiles, confidence intervals), correlation, or regression statistics. Pesticide exposures (e.g., milligrams per day per pound of active ingredient handled) can be estimated for any given combination of factors that define an exposure scenario such as: application method, mixing/loading method, level of protective clothing, formulation type, and cab type.

Currently, PHED will run only in Revelation G or a run-time version Revelation (G2B) which must be purchased separately through a local software dealer. Revelation is a product of ELF Software, 1419 Commerce Avenue, Longview WA 98632, 1-800-422-2511. NOTE: PHED will not operate with Advanced Revelation.

Dated: May 21, 1992.

Richard D. Schmitt,
Acting Director, Health Effects Division,
Office of Pesticide Programs.
[FR 92-12826 6-2-92; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

[OPPTS-140181; FRL-4059-8]

Access to Confidential Business Information to Certain Contractors

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of intended transfer of confidential business information to contractors.

SUMMARY: EPA intends to transfer confidential business information (CBI) collected from the pulp, paper, and paperboard manufacturing industry to two contractors. Transfer of the information will allow the contractors to assist EPA in developing regulations for the land application of sludge from pulp and paper mills using chlorine and chlorine-derivative bleaching processes under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), section 6. The information being transferred was collected under the authority of section 308 of the Clean

Water Act (CWA), section 114 of the Clean Air Act (CAA), and section 3007 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Interested persons may submit comments on this intended transfer of information to the addresses noted below.

DATES: Comments on the transfer of data are due June 15, 1992.

ADDRESSES: Comments on transfer of data collected under section 308 of CWA, section 114 of CAA, and section 3007 of RCRA may be sent to Lynne Blake-Hedges, Regulatory Impacts Branch, Economics and Technology Division (TS-779), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lynne Blake-Hedges at (202) 260-7241 for general information and Scott Sherlock at (202) 260-1536 for information regarding uses of CBI under TSCA authority.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA intends to transfer information, including CBI, to two contractors: Eastern Research Group, Inc. (ERG), 6 Whittmore St., Arlington, MA 02174 and ABT Associates (ABT), 4800 Montgomery Lane, Suite 500, Bethesda, MD 20814.

More specifically, the information being transferred to the contractors includes the following information collected under the authority of section 114 of CAA, section 308 of CWA, and section 3007 of RCRA: Information collected through questionnaires and surveys of the industry; all joint EPA-industry studies; site visit reports; monitoring and test data; test reports and sampling episodes reports; and analytical summaries of this information and data.

EPA also intends to transfer to ABT and ERG all information listed above (including CBI) that may be collected or developed in the future under the authorities listed above. This information is necessary to enable ABT and ERG to carry out the work required by their contracts to support EPA's development of regulations for the pulp, paper, and paperboard industry. The contractors, contract numbers, and type of support to be provided to EPA are listed in the following table:

EPA Office Receiving Support	Contractor	Contract No.	Type of Support
OPPTS/OPPT/ETD	ERG, Arlington, MA	68-D9-0169	Economic
OPPTS/OPPT/ETD	ERG, Arlington, MA	68-D0-0020	Economic
OPPTS/OPPT/ETD	ABT, Bethesda, MD	68-D9-0169	Economic
OPPTS/OPPT/ETD	ABT, Bethesda, MD	68-D0-0020	Economic

EPA Office Receiving Support	Contractor	Contract No.	Type of Support
OPPTS/OPPT OSWER/OSW	ABT, Bethesda, MD ABT, Bethesda, MD	68-CO-0093 68-CO-0093	Technical Technical

In the case of information claimed to be proprietary and, therefore, confidential, all regulations and confidentiality agreements apply. This transfer would not affect the status of this information as information claimed to be proprietary. The relevant contracts contain all confidentiality provisions required by EPA's confidentiality regulations. Need for access to the information shall continue until September 30, 1993.

In accordance with those regulations, companies who have submitted information claimed to be confidential have until June 15, 1992 to comment on EPA's proposed transfer of this information to ERG and ABT for the proposed outlined above.

Dated: May 27, 1992.

George A. Bonina,

Acting Director, Information Management Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics.

[FR Doc 92-12930 Filed 6-2-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

[OPPTS-59307B; FRL-4068-1]

Certain Chemicals; Approval of a Test Marketing Exemption

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces EPA's approval of an application for test marketing exemption (TME) under section 5(h)(1) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) and 40 CFR 720.38. EPA has designated this application as TME 92-9. The test marketing conditions are described below.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 28, 1992.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Vicki Anderson, New Chemicals Branch, Chemical Control Division (TS-794), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E-611, 401 M St. SW., Washington, DC 20460, (202) 260-4142.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 5(h)(1) of TSCA authorizes EPA to exempt persons from premanufacture notification (PMN) requirements and permit them to manufacture or import new chemical substances for test marketing purposes if the Agency finds

that the manufacture, processing, distribution in commerce, use, and disposal of the substances for test marketing purposes will not present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. EPA may impose restrictions on test marketing activities and may modify or revoke a test marketing exemption upon receipt of new information which casts significant doubt on its finding that the test marketing activity will not present an unreasonable risk of injury.

EPA hereby approves TME-92-9. EPA has determined that test marketing of the new chemical substance described below, under the conditions set out in the TME application, and for the time period and restrictions specified below, will not present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. Production volume, use, and the number of customers must not exceed that specified in the application. All other conditions and restrictions described in the application and in this notice must be met.

The following additional restrictions apply to TME-92-9. A bill of lading accompanying each shipment must state that the use of the substance is restricted to that approved in the TME. In addition, the applicant shall maintain the following records until 5 years after the date they are created, and shall make them available for inspection or copying in accordance with section 11 of TSCA:

1. Records of the quantity of the TME substance produced and the date of manufacture.
2. Records of dates of the shipments to each customer and the quantities supplied in each shipment.
3. Copies of the bill of lading that accompanies each shipment of the TME substance.

TME-92-9

Date of Receipt: April 15, 1992.

Notice of Receipt: April 28, 1992 (57 FR 17908).

Applicant: Confidential.

Chemical: (G) Alkylamine.

Use: (G) Flotation Agent.

Production Volume: Confidential.

Number of Customers: Confidential.

Test Marketing Period: 6 months, commencing on first day of commercial manufacture.

Risk Assessment: EPA identified no significant health or environmental concerns for the test market substance. Therefore, the test market activities will not present any unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment.

The Agency reserves the right to rescind approval or modify the conditions and restrictions of an exemption should any new information that comes to its attention cast significant doubt on its finding that the test marketing activities will not present any unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment.

Dated: May 28, 1992.

Linda Vlier Moos,

Acting Director, Chemical Control Division, Office of Toxic Substances

[FR Doc. 92-12931 Filed 6-2-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

ENDANGERED SPECIES COMMITTEE

Decision

AGENCY: Endangered Species Committee.

ACTION: Notice of decision.

SUMMARY: The Endangered Species Committee held a public meeting on Thursday, May 14, 1992 in Washington, DC, to consider and determine the application of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for exemption from the provisions of the Endangered Species Act for 44 timber sales from its FY 1991 timber sales program. By a vote of five to two, the Committee decided on the record to exempt 13 of the 44 timber sales, subject to mitigation and enhancement measures to be undertaken by the BLM. The decision of the Committee is set forth below.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A notice in the September 25, 1991 *Federal Register*, 56 FR 48546, advised that the Bureau of Land Management filed an application with the Secretary of the Interior seeking exemption under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act that would permit the Bureau to hold timber sales on 44 tracts remaining in its 1991 timber sales program in Oregon.

A notice in the October 22, 1991 *Federal Register*, 56 FR 55462, advised that on October 1, 1991, the

Secretary of the Interior, who is also the Chairman of the Endangered Species Committee, determined that the threshold requirements concerning the application have been met and that a hearing would be conducted.

The Secretary of the Interior designated Harvey C. Sweitzer, an Administrative Law Judge, to conduct the evidentiary hearing. The Administrative Law Judge was assisted by the staff of the Endangered Species Committee, which includes the Division of General Law, Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, and the Office of Program Analysis, Department of the Interior. The evidentiary hearing began on January 8, 1992 and concluded on January 30, 1992, in Portland, Oregon. See 56 FR 57633, November 13, 1991, the Federal Register notice that appointed the Administrative Law Judge and established the date of the hearing. An additional public hearing was conducted on February 12-13, 1992, in Portland. See 57 FR 4010, February 3, 1992, the Federal Register notice that established the date and location of the public hearing.

The Endangered Species Act requires the Chairman to submit a report to the Committee summarizing the hearing record and addressing specific criteria. The Secretary submitted the report to the Committee on April 29, 1992.

The viewing rooms in Portland and Washington, DC, in which the record was available for public inspection, have been closed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Jon H. Goldstein, (202) 208-4077.
John E. Schrote,

Assistant Secretary—Policy, Management and Budget, and Staff to the Chairman, Endangered Species Committee.

Application for Exemption by the Bureau of Land Management To Conduct 44 Timber Sales in Western Oregon

Decision

Deny 31 and allow 13 of 44 timber sales for which exemption is sought. Specific sales that meet the criteria as discussed below will be allowed.

Proceedings of the Committee

Pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (ESA), 16 U.S.C. 1530 et seq., and its implementing regulations, 50 CFR subchapter C, the Secretary of the Interior convened the Endangered Species Committee (Committee) after making certain threshold determinations on October 1, 1991. An evidentiary hearing was held January 8-30, 1992 in Portland, Oregon. The Secretary presented his report summarizing the record on April 29, 1992. On May 14,

1992, the Committee decided to grant the exemption in part.

Proposed Agency Action

In this case, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is both the applicant and the action agency. BLM seeks exemption for 44 proposed timber sales from its FY 1991 timber sales program. As a result of its consultations under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) found that these 44 sales were likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the northern spotted owl.

As the BLM's application shows, 44 individual sales were submitted to FWS for consultations under section 7. FWS issued a single document containing separate biological opinions that addressed the sales. The record does not contain any unity of approach among the parties on this matter, although most analysis and data appeared to analyze some aggregate number of sales. Based on the complex nature of the timber sales program and the consultations under the ESA, as well as on the structure and complexion of the evidence received by the Committee, the Committee determined that the application seeks one exemption with 44 subparts. The Committee has analyzed the record sale by sale and in the aggregate in light of the exemption criteria.

Basis for Decision

Reflecting the provisions of section 7(h) that all criteria must be met to exempt an agency action, the Committee applied the exemption criteria one by one in such a manner that failure to meet any one criterion eliminated the sale from further consideration for exemption. However, the Committee noted each criterion under which a sale would be eliminated.

The Committee's decision to grant a partial exemption allowing 13 sales is based on its determinations that:

(i) For a limited number of the 44 sales, a reasonable and prudent alternative exists, because of the proximity and comparability of some sales from the FY 1992 timber sales program that received "no jeopardy" opinions from the FWS after consultations under section 7 of the ESA. For the rest of the FY 1991 sales, there are no reasonable and prudent alternatives.

(ii) The benefits of the 13 specific timber sales clearly outweigh the benefits of alternative courses of action consistent with conserving the species or its critical habitat, and the sales are in the public interest.

(iii) The sales are of regional significance in that their economic effects have, at a minimum, county-wide impact in the two counties in which they are located.

(iv) The Committee finds no evidence in the record demonstrating that the BLM has made any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources.

These determinations were made on the record and are summarized below.

Criterion 1: Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives to the Agency Action

The record contains significant evidence that FY 1992 timber sales that received "no jeopardy" opinions from the FWS after consultation under the ESA could constitute reasonable and prudent alternatives. Of these 82 sales, 32 are located in the BLM resource areas that include the 44 FY 1991 sales for which exemption is sought. The Committee finds that proximity to and relative comparability with the exemption sales are important factors in determining which FY 1992 sales are reasonable and prudent. Of these 32, however, three are in critical habitat units and are now the subject of consultation regarding possible adverse modification of critical habitat. Further, 13 of the remaining 32 FY 1992 sales are in informal conferencing with FWS for the marbled murrelet, leaving 18 for consideration as reasonable and prudent alternatives.

The Committee compared these FY 1992 sales against the FY 1991 sales for which BLM seeks exemption that are in the same resource areas due to proximity, comparability and impact on jobs. Comparability of sales is based on board footage, as summarized in Chapter 1, Table 1.2, in the Secretary's report. The distribution of these 16 sales among the resource areas is such that only 12 can serve as reasonable and prudent alternatives.

Ten of the 16 FY 1992 sales serve as reasonable and prudent alternatives for 10 FY 1991 sales located in various resource areas. The other six FY 1992 sales are located in the South Umpqua Resource Area. Two of these six sales serve as reasonable and prudent alternative to the single FY 1991 sale in that resource area. These are no other FY 1991 sales in that resource area for which any of the other four FY 1992 sales can serve as reasonable and prudent alternatives.

Accordingly, the Committee denies exemption for those 11 FY 1991 sales for which reasonable and prudent alternatives exist in the FY 1992 sales. The following 11 FY 1991 sales are denied exemption, based on the

existence of reasonable and prudent alternatives:

Yamhill Resource Area: Back in the Saddle, Kitchen Door, Tigger Too, and Rootballs.
 Drain Resource Area: Barneys Peak.
 Tioga Resource Area: Green Cedar.
 Dillard Resource Area: Pea Gravel Clay and Salty Dog.
 South Valley Resource Area: Fox Hollow and Stennets Fawn Farm.
 South Umpqua Resource Area: Horse Heaven.

The Committee recognizes that the FY 1992 sales currently are enjoined pending the outcome of continuing litigation in the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Criterion 2: The Benefits of the Remaining FY 1991 Sales Clearly Outweigh the Benefits of Alternative Courses of Action Consistent With Conserving the Species or its Critical Habitat, and the Sales Are in the Public Interest

Alternative courses of action would include the reasonable and prudent alternatives, as well as those discussed in chapter 3 of the Secretary's Report. Tables 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 of the Secretary's report provide the model for comparing these benefits. After analyzing the quantitative and qualitative data for the sales in the aggregate, the Committee finds that the benefits of the sales "clearly outweigh" the benefits of alternative courses of action consistent with conserving the species or its habitat. In particular, the stumpage benefits of conducting the sales are significantly greater than the stumpage benefits of not conducting the sales. In addition, the total benefits of the sales are much greater than total benefits of not holding the sales.

The location of a sale in designated critical habitat or a designated conservation area (DCA) in the Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl (draft) was used as the determinant or "public interest." Accordingly, the Committee finds that the following 12 sales falling within the boundaries of designated critical habitat or a DCA are not in the public interest, and thus are denied exemption:

Northside, Renhaven, Elk 24, Brownson Headwater, Young Leo, Alma Ranch, Table Creek, Eddy Whittaker, Clabber Creek, Amberson Creek, Herb Cluster, 33 and 1.

The Committee finds that the following sale, which was denied under criterion 1, also would be denied exemption as not in the public interest because it falls within the species' critical habitat:

Horse Heaven.

The Committee finds that the sales that were not eliminated under criteria 2 and 3 are in the public interest, because they will provide important benefits in terms of county revenues and continued employment for the affected region, which clearly outweigh those of alternative courses of action.

Criterion 3: The Sales Are of Regional or National Significance

The economic impact information in the record measured the impacts of the sales in terms of the county in which the sales are located. On a sale-by-sale basis, the effects can be county-wide, or may extend beyond the boundaries of any single county, depending on the location of and amount of timber in a given sale. The Committee finds that county-wide impact constitutes regional significance.

The Committee examined a number of factors to determine those sales that would be regionally significant. The Committee reviewed the proposed sales in the context of those counties in which the direct timber jobs associated with the sales are high in comparison to non-timber employment, as set out in Tables 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10 in the Secretary's Report; against county-wide unemployment figures, as set out in Table 4.2; against the relative reliance of counties budgets upon timber sale revenues, as demonstrated in Tables 4.3, 4.4 and 4.6 of the Secretary's Report; and in light of other pertinent information related to the counties involved in the sales.

There were two separate "screens" used for this analysis. First, the remaining sales (those that were not eliminated under either criteria 1 and 2) were evaluated against criteria that constituted a measure of relative size and importance economically and a measure of relative impact on the owl and its habitat. Under this test, sales were deemed to be not of regional significance if they resulted in low county revenue sharing, low timber volume, or high impact on the owl or its habitat (take of owls and/or significant modification of dispersal habitat).

Accordingly, the Committee denies the following six sales under this analysis:

Cross Out, Callahan 20 Cleanup, Last Yankee, Lake Creek, Independence, Luts Breakout.

The following sales, which were denied under criteria 1 and 2, also would be denied under this analysis:

Green Cedar, Salty Dog, Fox Hollow, Back in the Saddle, Clabber Creek, Alma Ranch, Table Creek, Eddy Whittaker.

Second, the Committee evaluated several economic characteristics of six counties involved in the 44 sales to determine if certain counties would be more greatly affected by loss of some or all of the sales. Coos County and Douglas County were highest of all six counties in terms of unemployment, timber employment relative to total employment, percentage of county budgets from O&C revenues, percent of county budgets represented by the remaining sales (not eliminated in criteria 1 and 2), and timber jobs derived from the sales relative to total timber employment.

Using "county" as a region, the Committee determines that the remaining sales falling in Lane, Lincoln, Yamhill and Polk Counties are not of regional significance. Accordingly, the Committee denies exemption to two sales:

Chopped Hamm, Weiss Road.

Under this analysis, additional sales already denied under criteria 1, 2, or the first screen in criterion 3 also would have been denied exemption:

Fox Hollow, Alma Ranch, Lake Creek, Young Leo, Table Creek, Stennets Fawn Farm, Eddy Whittaker, Back in the Saddle, Kitchen Door, Tigger Too, Rootballs, 33 and 1.

After examining and applying these several factors, the Committee determines that the resulting exempted sales are regionally significant. The resulting exempted sales are located in Douglas and Coos Counties, which are more timber-dependent than the other counties and will experience the largest relative economic effects, both in terms of employment and county share of O & C timber receipts. (While Lincoln County's timber employment dependence generally is comparable to that of Douglas and Coos Counties, the sole FY 1991 timber sale in Lincoln County was denied exemption due to the existence of a comparable and proximate FY 1992 sale that may be substituted as a reasonable and prudent alternative under the first criterion.)

Criterion 4: There Has Been No Irreversible or Irrecoverable Commitment of Resources

The Committee found no evidence in the record demonstrating that the BLM has made any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources.

Sales To Be Exempted

As a result of applying the exemption criteria, the Committee finds for 13 sales that there are no reasonable and prudent alternatives, that the benefits

clearly outweigh the benefits of alternative courses of actions, that they are of regional significance, and that the Bureau of Land Management has not made any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources. Accordingly, the Committee grants exemptions for the following 13 sales:

Prego, Moore Coon, Pita Ridge, King Smith, Fall Apart, Chicken Deluxe, Halfway Oxbow, Devore Mountain, Windy, Bateman & Robin, North Sand Creek, Four Gates, Camas Valley West.

Mitigation Measures

The Committee adopts all of BLM's suggestions for mitigation measures to be performed by BLM as integral parts of the exempted sales, modified to maximize the use of land exchange first, rather than acquisition. Additionally, the Committee adopts the mitigation measures set forth on the attachment to this Decision.

Section 7(k) of the ESA

The Committee adopts the recommendations of Counsel to the Committee in his memorandum of April 29, 1992. The Committee therefore declines to issue a finding as to the legal adequacy of BLM's environmental documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act. The Committee is satisfied that an environmental impact statement (EIS) has been previously prepared and that environmental assessments addressing each sale have been tiered to that EIS. The Committee also has reviewed additional evidence in the record regarding the quality and content of the environmental documentation. The Committee believes that the record is complete regarding the environmental issues and accepts the Chairman's conclusion that the requirements of section 7(k) are met.

Order

On the basis of the findings stated above, the Committee grants exemptions for 13 of the 44 FY 1991 timber sales, provided that the mitigation and enhancement measures recommended by BLM, as well as those set forth on the attached addendum, are funded concurrently with the execution of the sales.

Signed on behalf of the Endangered Species Committee:

Date: May 15, 1992.

Manuel Lujan, Jr.

Chairman.

Attachment.

Endangered Species Committee Amendment

As a measure of mitigation for the granting of these 13 exemptions, the Endangered Species Committee (ESC) directs BLM to implement the final recovery plan for the Northern Spotted Owl as expeditiously as possible.

The ESC further directs BLM to use the recovery plan for the Northern Spotted Owl as the basis for its decadal plan. This plan should adequately address concerns about the recovery of the Northern Spotted Owl and shall be consistent with the best available scientific and commercial data, which includes the scientific evidence and information collected by the Inter-Agency Scientific Committee, during the critical habitat rule and draft recovery plan, and as it develops. No single timber sale shall be offered until the decadal plan has gone through a 60-day comment period and has been approved by the DOI. If approval of the decadal plan is delayed beyond the initial comment period and if that delay is beyond the control of the DOI, then sales that are not inconsistent with the Recovery Plan may continue.

The BLM must submit its 1993 annual and decadal plans for consultation as a whole. If BLM, in consultation with FWS, is unable to identify appropriate time [sic] management and owl conservation strategies that will not jeopardized the continued existence of the Northern Spotted Owl, it is the ESC's desire that the FWS issue and opinion on the plan as a whole and not on individual sales. If FWS concurrence is not forthcoming, the BLM could once again apply to the ESC for an exemption from the requirements of section 7 of the ESA.

[FR Doc. 92-12960 Filed 6-2-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-10-M

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Jones Bancorp, Inc., et al.; Formations of; Acquisitions by; and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied for the Board's approval under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842) and § 225.14 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.14) to become a bank holding company or to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the applications are set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

Each application is available for immediate inspection at the Federal

Reserve Bank indicated. Once the application has been accepted for processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Any comment on an application that requests a hearing must include a statement of why a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute and summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received not later than June 26, 1992.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago (David S. Epstein, Vice President) 230 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60690:

1. *Jones Bancorp, Inc.*, Marcellus, Michigan; to become a bank holding company by acquiring 100 percent of the voting shares of G.W. Exchange Bank, Marcellus, Michigan.

B. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (James M. Lyon, Vice President) 250 Marquette Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480:

1. *Bigfork Bancshares, Inc.*, Bigfork, Minnesota; to become a bank holding company by acquiring 99.2 percent of the voting shares of First State Bank of Bigfork, Bigfork, Minnesota, and thereby indirectly acquire First State Bank of Bigfork, Bigfork, Minnesota.

2. *Bowbells Holding Company*, Bowbells, North Dakota; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of First National Bank, Minot, North Dakota, a *de novo* bank.

C. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City (John E. Yorke, Senior Vice President) 925 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 64198:

1. *Broadmoor Capital Corporation*, Colorado Springs, Colorado; to become a bank holding company by acquiring 100 percent of the voting shares of The Bank at Broadmoor, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

D. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco (Kenneth R. Binning, Director, Bank Holding Company) 101 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94105:

1. *West One Bancorp*, Boise, Idaho, and *West One Bancorp*, Washington, Bellevue, Washington; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of Yakima Valley Bank, Yakima, Washington.