designation in the two preferred alternatives compared to the 594,350 acres that qualified and the lack of management guidelines and the analysis of potential impacts to water quality that would result from increasing motorized trail use.

ERP No. D–AFS–J65349–UT Rating EC2, Griffin Springs Resource Management Project, Implementation, Commercial Timber Harvesting, Aspen Regeneration, Management Ignited Prescribed Fire, and Road Work, Dixie National Forest, Escalante Ranger District, Garfield County, UT.

Summary

EPA expressed environmental concerns with potential adverse impacts from road upgrades and maintenance, beetle suppression and routine management activities to old growth forests, wetlands and wildlife. The FEIS should include additional site specific analysis/description of road and beetle management strategies.

ERP No. D–AFS–J65352–MT Rating EC2, Kelsey-Beaver Fire Recovery Project, Implementation of Fuel Reduction and Salvage of Fire-Killed Trees within Roderick South, Kelsey Creek, and Upper Beaver Areas, Kootenai National Forest, Three Rivers Ranger District, Lincoln County, MT.

Summary

EPA supported proposed watershed and road system improvements. EPA expressed environmental concerns with the limited range of alternatives analyzed and potential adverse impacts to water quality. EPA recommended that additional winter logging be considered and stabilization of eroding banks on streams to reduce sediment production. EPA also suggests the final EIS address the consistency of proposed actions with State TMDL development needs for the 303(d) listed South Fork Yaak River.

ERP No. D–NPS–D65023–DC Rating LO, Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site, Implementation, General Management Plan, Washington, DC.

Summary

EPA expressed lack of objections and concurs with the selection of Alternative 2.

ERP No. DS–AFS–J65288–CO Rating EC2, Uncompahgre National Forest Travel Plans Revision, and Forest Plan Amendment, Updated Information, Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forests, Garrison, Hinsdale Mesa, Montrose, Ouray, San Juan Counties, CO.

Summary

EPA expressed environmental concerns with the lack of detail provided for the monitoring plan and its implementation and there are no adaptative management strategies discussed to address unanticipated impacts to natural resources.

ERP No. DS–MMS–L67008–ID Rating EO2, Smoky Canyon Mine Panels B and C, Propose to Mine Phosphate Ore Reserves in the Final Two Mine Panels, National Forest System Lands and Federal Mineral Leases, Caribou National Forest, Permit, Caribou County, ID.

Summary

EPA expressed environmental objections based on predicted selenium contamination of the Wells Formation aquifer exceeding the national ground water standard, the absence of a low-permeable cap design to minimize impacts to ground water, a narrow project scope which did not examine impacts from continued use of the tailings pond and possible mitigation measures, and inadequate mitigation, monitoring, and financial assurance for the entire project. EPA requested that these issues be addressed before issuing a final EIS.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–BLM–K65340–NV Reno Clay Plant Project, Construct and Operate an Open-Pit Clay Mine and Ore Processing Facility, Plan-of-Operations, Oil-Dri Corporation of Nevada, Hungry Valley, Washoe County, NV.

Summary

EPA expressed continuing environmental concerns regarding the project's potential impacts to water quality and the need for additional information regarding monitoring and mitigation to address air and water quality concerns. Any adverse impacts from the project would disproportionately affect the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony adjacent to the project site. EPA commended BLM and Oil-Dri for working with a private land owner to secure a road right-of-way that will reduce air, noise and traffic impacts to local residents. EPA will review Washoe CountyAQMD's draft minor source air permit when it becomes available for public review.

ERP No. F–FHW–G40157–TX Tyler Loop 49 West, Construction from the TX–155

Highway to I–20 Highway, Funding, NPDES and

COE Section 404 Permits, Smith County, TX.

Summary

EPA had no objections to the action as proposed.

ERP No. F–NPS–G65079–OK Washita Battlefield National Historic Site, General Management Plan, Implementation, Roger Mill County, OK.

Summary

EPA had no objections or comments on the Final EIS.

Dated: October 23, 2001.

Joseph C. Montgomery,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 01–27044 Filed 10–25–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPP–00734A; FRL–6809–1]

Workshop Series on Bt Corn Insect Resistance Management Framework Development; Notice of Public Meeting; Change of Meeting Date

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: In the **Federal Register** of August 31, 2001 (66 FR 45985) (FRL–6797–8), EPA announced that it would hold a series of workshops focusing on Bt corn insect resistance management (IRM). This notice announces a change in the date for the meeting originally scheduled for October 29 and 30, 2001. The meeting will now be held on November 5 and 6, 2001.

DATES: The meeting scheduled for October 29 and 30, 2001, will now be held on November 5 and 6, 2001, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Requests for participation in the meeting must be received on or before November 2, 2001.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at EPA, Crystal Station, Room C, 2800 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202. Space is limited. Requests to participate may be submitted by mail, electronically, or in person. Please follow the detailed instructions for each method as provided in Unit III. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** of the originally published notice of August 31, 2001. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, your request must identify docket control number OPP–00734A in the subject line on the first page of your response.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Glaser; National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Environmental Protection Agency, 26 W. King Dr.,

Cincinnati, OH 45268; telephone number: (513) 569–7568; fax number: (513) 487–2511; e-mail address: glaser.john@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This action is directed to the public in general. This action may, however, be of interest to: Registrants and users of Bt corn under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), or the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as well as non-users of Bt corn and the public. Since other entities may also be interested, the Agency has not attempted to describe all the specific entities that may be affected by this action. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Bt corn.

Dated: October 19, 2001.

Janet L. Andersen,

Director, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 01–27008 Filed 10–23–01; 2:38 pm]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7090–8]

EPA Science Advisory Board; Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meeting

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that the Environmental Economics Advisory Committee (EEAC) of the US EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB), will meet on Friday, November 30, 2001 in the Rachel Carson Great Hall of the EPA Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20005. The meeting will begin at 8:30 a.m. and adjourn no later than 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time. The meeting is open to the public, however, seating is limited and available on a first come basis.

Purpose of the Meeting—The purpose of the meeting will be to: (a) Receive a status briefing on EPA's continuing efforts to enhance its practices for estimating the benefits of environmental actions that reduce mortality risks; (b) to engage in a Consultation with EPA representatives on possible opportunities for using incentives in the area of water and other areas of environmental pollution control; and (c) to engage in a Consultation with EPA representatives on the approach they wish to implement to develop their economic research strategy.

Background—(a) Value of Statistical Life (VSL) as a Measure of Benefits From Environmental Actions—The EEAC, and other Science Advisory Board Committees, have held a series of interactions with EPA representatives over the past few years on ways to estimate the benefits that are predicted to come from environmental actions. Examples of such interactions include: (a) The review of EPA's guidelines for economic analysis (see 63 FR 150:41820; 64 FR 56:14232; 64 FR 205:57452); (b) the review of EPA's white paper on Valuing Fatal Cancer Risk Reductions (see 65 FR 24:5637); (c) the SAB review of the benefits and costs of arsenic control in drinking water (see 66 FR 74:19770; 66 FR 127:34924) and (d) the SAB reviews of the benefits and costs of the Clean Air Act (e.g., see SAB reports EPA–SAB–COUNCIL–LTR–97–001, EPA–SAB–COUNCIL–ADV–00–001, EPA–SAB–COUNCIL–ADV–01–004—please see the SAB website *www.epa.gov/sab* for copies of these reports). The EPA National Center for Environmental Economics (NCEE) and other EPA offices now intend to present a draft plan to the EEAC that outlines EPA's efforts that will help EPA reach a resolution on best practices for a more complete and reliable accounting of the benefits of mortality risk reductions.

The Agency now uses a central estimate for valuation of reduced mortality risks, and makes adjustments to reflect the impact of factors such as identifiable latency periods and income growth over time. There are recognized limitations to these estimates, and these limitations provide the focus for an active research agenda for economists at EPA and outside the Agency. NCEE and other EPA offices conduct a variety of activities related to valuation of reduced mortality risks. These activities include: (a) The development of a review and assessment of the empirical literature that serves as a basis for EPA's value of statistical life (VSL) estimates, (b) development of more complete and reliable benefit transfer values for an environmental context, and (c) identification of directions for policy-relevant research.

EPA will outline its activities for collecting and disseminating new information as well as conducting and funding additional research designed to fill research needs. The Committee will consider how it might continue to interact with EPA as the Agency moves forward with this effort.

(b) Economic Incentives Consultation—The Committee will engage in a Consultation with EPA representatives on the Agency's consideration of opportunities for application of innovative and incentives-based approaches for environmental and health protection. EPA desires feedback from individual members of the Committee on criteria that might be used to select candidate areas for considering the applicability of such methods and for feedback on what topical areas might be considered as part of the agency's agenda for further development.

Over the last 20 years, and particularly during the past decade, economic incentives have been increasingly used to control pollution and improve environmental and health protection at the federal, state and local levels. Economic incentives are instruments that use financial means to motivate polluters to reduce the health and environmental risks posed by their facilities, processes, or products. Examples include pollution charges, fees, and taxes; deposit-refund systems; and trading programs. Economic incentives offer several advantages that make them attractive environmental management tools. In many cases incentives generate benefits beyond what is possible with traditional regulations; sometimes they are applied where traditional regulations might not be possible. They are particularly useful for small and geographically dispersed sources. They can also provide impetus for technological change.

EPA plans to continue to explore opportunities to use, significantly expand, or usefully support State or local governments in the use of innovative approaches, particularly market-based economic incentives. EPA will discuss possible opportunities for using incentives in the area of water pollution as well as other areas, and hope to share some recent examples of experiences where incentives have been used successfully for environmental pollution control.

(c) Research Strategy Development—The Committee will engage in a Consultation with EPA representatives on the approach they are considering for development of an environmental economics research strategy. EPA desires feedback from individual members of the Committee on whether this is an appropriate approach, given the goals of the strategy, for its development. Further, they would like to learn of additional techniques or considerations that might improve the proposed developmental approach. The Agency intends to return to the SAB for a formal peer review of their completed research strategy in late FY 2002.