model was calibrated using data obtained in 1997 for the variety DPL 5415 RR in Starkville, Mississippi, on a Marietta soil. Calibration of the model involved determining cultivar-specific values of 11 parameters to provide a best fit between model output and measured crop characteristics (e.g., plant height, number of nodes, stem weight, fruit count, fruit weight). The calibrated model accurately predicted plant growth from the same cultivar grown in Stoneville, Mississippi, on a Bosket loam in 1998. Notably, 1997 was a cool wet year, whereas 1998 was a hot dry year. The model's success in simulating responses to these environmental and soils differences indicates its robustness and utility.

CPM has the potential to be useful as a decision aid for cotton farmers and crop production consultants. If fully developed, it would be a valuable tool to optimize management inputs such as irrigation, fertilization, plant growth regulators, and defoliant application prior to harvest. In its current version, however, CPM has not yet been fully validated to be useful as a decision aid. The released version of CPM should be considered an advanced model suitable for research purposes. ARS does not endorse its use for any other purpose at this time. Of particular importance to a decision aid model is the user interface. The interface under which CPM has been developed and tested is one that was earlier developed for the soybean model, GLYCIM, and has been documented elsewhere (Acock, B., Pachepsky, Y. A., Mironenko, E. V., Whisler, F. D., and Reddy, V. R. 1999. GUICS: A Generic User Interface for On-Farm Crop Simulations. Agronomy Journal. 91:657–665). However, this interface is not part of the current release, and the user will need to develop or adapt one for his or her own needs.

The CPM Development Team was an *ad hoc* group drawn from numerous ARS laboratories across the Cotton Belt. Dr. Basil Acock, ARS, Beltsville, Maryland, led the team that developed CPM to its present stage. Drs. Rick Olson and Yakov Pachepsky were the other central members of the development team. The other team members included, Drs. Eugene Marenenko, Avi Marani, Ron Sequeira, and Hal Lemmon. The CPM Validation Team was led by Dr. Gretchen F. Sassenrath-Cole, ARS, Stoneville, MS, with a very large team of cooperators.

ARS is releasing the source code and documentation of CPM at this time, under the Authority: 35 U.S.C. 207, so that interested parties can continue to develop the model for their own needs and purposes. ARS does not foresee providing monetary or technical support for the efforts of others to refine, adapt, or use this model, and provides no warranty for its use for any purpose. ARS does not reserve any rights or interests in the work that may be performed by others to refine or adapt it. ARS does reserve the right to continue its own refinement of the current version of the model at a later date, should program needs require it.

Michael D. Ruff,

Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 02–10565 Filed 4–29–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–03–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food Safety and Inspection Service

[Docket No. 02–013N]

Exemption for Retail Store Operations

AGENCY: Food Safety and Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of adjusted dollar limitations.

SUMMARY: The Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) is announcing automatic increases in the dollar limitations on sales of meat and meat food products and poultry products to hotels, restaurants, and similar institutions that do not disqualify a store for exemption from Federal inspection requirements. By action of FSIS' regulations, for calendar year 2002, the dollar limitation for meat and meat food products has increased from $44,900 to $47,000 and for poultry products from $39,800 to $41,600. These increases are based on price changes for these products evidenced by the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

EFFECTIVE DATE: This notice is effective April 30, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information contact Daniel Engeljohn, Ph.D., Director, Regulations and Directives Development Staff, Office of Policy, Program Development, and Evaluation, FSIS, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 112, Cotton Annex Building, 300 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20250–3700; telephone (202) 720–5627, fax (202) 690–0486.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) and the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 451 *et seq.*) provide that the statutory provisions requiring inspection of the slaughter of livestock or poultry and the preparation or processing of products thereof do not apply to operations of types traditionally and usually conducted at retail stores and restaurants, when conducted at any retail store or restaurant or similar retail-type establishment for sale in normal retail quantities or service to consumers at such establishments (21 U.S.C. 454(c)(2)and 661 (c)(2)). In §§ 303.1(d) and 381.10(d), respectively (9 CFR 303.1(d) and 381.10(d)), FSIS regulations address the conditions under which requirements for inspection do not apply to retail operations.

Under these regulations, sales to hotels, restaurants, and similar institutions disqualify a store for exemption if they exceed either of two maximum limits: 25 percent of the dollar value of total product sales or the calendar year dollar limitation set by the Administrator. The dollar limitation is adjusted automatically during the first quarter of the year if the CPI, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, indicates an increase or decrease of more than $500 in the price of the same volume of product for the previous year. FSIS publishes a notice of the adjusted dollar limitations in the **Federal Register**. (See paragraphs (d)(2)(iii)(b) and (d)(2)(vi) of §§ 303.1 and 381.10.)

The CPI for 2001 reveals an average annual price increase for meat and meat food products of 4.6 percent and for poultry products of 4.4 percent. When rounded off to the nearest $100.00, the price increase for meat and meat food products is $2,100.00 and for poultry products is $1,800.00. Because the price of meat and meat food products and the price of poultry products have increased by more than $500, in accordance with §§ 300.1 (d)(2)(iii)(b) and 381.10 (d)(2)(iii)(*b*) of the regulations FSIS has increased the dollar limitation on sales to hotels, restaurants, and similar institutions from $44,900 to $47,000 for meat and meat food products and from $39,800 to $41,000 for poultry products for calendar year 2002.

Additional Public Notification

Public awareness of all segments of rulemaking and policy development is important. Consequently, in an effort to better ensure that minorities, women, and persons with disabilities are aware of this final rule, FSIS will announce and provide copies of this **Federal Register** notice in the *FSIS Constituent Update*. FSIS provides a weekly *FSIS Constituent Update* via fax to over 300 organizations and individuals. In addition, the update is available on line through the FSIS web page located at *http://www.fsis.usda.gov*. The update is

used to provide information regarding FSIS policies, procedures, regulations, **Federal Register** notices, FSIS public meetings, recalls, and any other types of information that could affect or would be of interest to our constituents/stakeholders. The constituent fax list consists of industry, trade, and farm groups, consumer interest groups, allied health professionals, scientific professionals, and other individuals that have requested to be included. Through these various channels, FSIS is able to provide information to a much broader, more diverse audience than would be otherwise possible.

For more information or to be added to the constituent fax list, fax your request to the Congressional and Public Affairs Office, at (202) 720–5704.

Done at Washington, DC, on: April 24, 2002.

William J. Hudnall,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 02–10538 Filed 4–29–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–DM–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Kootenai (KNF) and Idaho Panhandle National Forests (IPNF); Montana, Idaho and Washington; Revised Land and Resource Management Plans

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement in conjunction with revision of the Land and Resource Management Plans (hereafter referred to as Forest Plan or Plans) for the Kootenai and Idaho Panhandle National Forests (Kootenai Idaho Panhandle Zone, hereafter referred to as KIPZ) located in Lincoln, Sanders, and Flathead counties in Montana; Bonner, Boundary, Kootenai, Shoshone and Benewah, Latah, and Clearwater counties in Idaho; and Pend Oreille county in Washington.

SUMMARY: The USDA—Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement in conjunction with the revision of Land and Resource Management Plans for the KIPZ. This notice describes the initial revision topics and issues with the current Forest Plans, estimated dates for filing the environmental impact statement, information concerning public participation, and the names and addresses of the agency officials who can provide additional information.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope of the analysis must be received in writing by December 1, 2002. The draft environmental impact statement is expected by December 2003 and the final environmental impact statement is expected by April 2005.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments and suggestions to Forest Supervisor, c/o Forest Plan Revision, Kootenai National Forest, 1101 W Hwy 2, Libby, MT 59923.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joe Krueger at (406) 293–6211 or Gary Ford at (208) 765–7478.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Plan revisions are warranted in light of the combined effects of multiple needs for change. The preliminary revision issues have been developed from discussions with Kootenai and Idaho Panhandle National Forests employees, our Monitoring and Evaluation Reports, current science and assessments, and our daily contact with our public. The preliminary issues have been divided into two categories:

Revision Topics—This category includes topics for which resource conditions, technical knowledge, or public perception of resource management have created a ''need for change'' in the Forest Plans. These topics generally would be significant amendments because their resolution could result in changes to management direction over large areas of the Forests, changes in the mix of goods and services that the Forests provide, and changes to other decisions made in the Forest Plans. They involve choices in management direction where there is no clear public consensus on the best course of action.

Other Revision Items—A number of items were identified that need to be addressed in the Forest Plans, but do not meet the above criteria for Revision Topics. In general, these items represent inadequate or out-of-date Forest Plan direction and addressing these items would not require a significant amendment to the Forest Plans. There appears to be general consensus on how to resolve the issue by rewriting and updating the Forest Plans Standards and Guidelines during Forest Plan Revision. Following are the Revision Topics/Preliminary Issues that have been identified to date:

I. Revision Topics

National Forest System lands are capable of contributing essential elements in managing for sustainability. Sustainability is widely recognized as the overarching objective of land and resource management. Sustainability in land management has three components: ecological, economic, and social. These different components of sustainability are interrelated. The sustainability of ecological systems is a necessary prerequisite for strong, productive economies and enduring human communities. At the same time, we compromise human welfare if we fail to sustain vital, functioning ecological systems. In addition, strong economies and communities are often a prerequisite to societies possessing the will and patience needed to sustain ecological systems.

The revision topics have been developed around the ecological, economic, and social components of sustainability. The planning questions for each revision topic provide information that further defines the topic and how we intend to address it in plan revision.

Ecological Components of Sustainability

Ecological sustainability is defined as: ''The ability to maintain diversity, productivity, resilience to stress, health, and yields of desired values, resource uses, products, or services over time in an ecosystem while maintaining its integrity.'' (cited from Sustaining Ecosystems: A Conceptual Approach, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, R5–EM–TP–001, p. 212).

Topic 1—Terrestrial

Forest plan monitoring, geographic area assessments, the Northern Region Overview, and the Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Project have identified problems in maintaining terrestrial sustainability on our national forest lands. Examples of findings in these assessments indicate we are lacking in early seral tree species and have an increasing amount of shade-tolerant, fire intolerant, and insect and disease prone tree species dominating the landscape. Decades of fire suppression have resulted in higher fuel loading and landscapes that may pose risk to terrestrial sustainability. There is a reduction in large snags on portions of the landscape. Past timber harvest has resulted in a decrease in interior habitat in late successional stands.

Planning Question #1

What structure, composition, and function of vegetation components are needed to contribute to long-term terrestrial sustainability?

Planning Question #2

What species are at risk and which are not and what strategies are needed to contribute to sustaining all native and desired non-native species?