may not equal the product of the annual number of responses multiplied by the reporting burden per response.)

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Done in Washington, DC, this 22nd day of February 2002 .

W. Ron DeHaven,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 02–4804 Filed 2–27–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–U

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. 02–013–1]

Notice of Request for Extension of Approval of an Information Collection

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Extension of approval of an information collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's intention to request an extension of approval of an information collection in support of the specifications for the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of marine mammals under the Animal Welfare Act regulations.

DATES: We will consider all comments we receive that are postmarked, delivered, or e-mailed by April 29, 2002.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by postal mail/commercial delivery or by e-mail. If you use postal mail/commercial delivery, please send four copies of your comment (an original and three copies) to: Docket No. 02–013–1, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3C71, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1238. Please state that your comment refers to Docket No. 02–013–1. If you use e-mail, address your comment to *regulations@aphis.usda.gov*. Your comment must be contained in the body of your message; do not send attached files. Please include your name and address in your message and ''Docket No. 02–013–1'' on the subject line.

You may read any comments that we receive on this docket in our reading room. The reading room is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 690–2817 before coming.

APHIS documents published in the **Federal Register**, and related information, including the names of organizations and individuals who have commented on APHIS dockets, are available on the Internet at *http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ppd/rad/webrepor.html*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information regarding the Animal Welfare Act regulations and standards for marine mammals, contact Dr. Barbara Kohn, Senior Staff Veterinarian, Animal Care, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 84, Riverdale, MD 20737–1234; (301) 734–7833. For copies of more detailed information on the information collection, contact Mrs. Celeste Sickles, APHIS' Information Collection Coordinator, at (301) 734–7477.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Animal Welfare.

OMB Number: 0579–0115.

Type of Request: Extension of approval of an information collection.

Abstract: The Animal Welfare Act standards and regulations have been promulgated to promote and ensure the humane care and treatment of regulated animals. The regulations in 9 CFR part 3, subpart E, address specifications for the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of marine mammals. These specifications require facilities to keep certain records and provide certain information that are needed to enforce the Animal Welfare Act and the regulations.

The regulations (9 CFR part 3, subpart E) require facilities to complete many information collection activities, such as written protocols for cleaning, contingency plans, daily records of animal feeding, water quality records, documentation of facility-based employee training, plans for any animals kept in isolation, medical records, a description of the interactive program, and health certificates. These information collection activities do not mandate the use of any official government form and are necessary to enforce regulations intended to ensure the humane care and treatment of marine mammals.

We are asking the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve our use of these information collection activities for an additional 3 years.

The purpose of this notice is to solicit comments form the public (as well as affected agencies) concerning our information collection. These comments will help us:

(1) Evaluate whether the collection of information is necessary fo the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through use, as appropriate, of automated, electronic, mechanical, and other collection technologies; e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Estimate of burden: The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.5952 hours per response.

Respondents: Employees or attendants of USDA licensed/registered marine mammal facilities.

Estimated annual number of respondents: 3,170.

Estimated annual number of responses per respondent: 8.6208.

Estimated annual number of responses: 27,328.

Estimated total annual burden on respondents: 16,265 hours. (Due to averaging, the total annual burden hours may not equal the product of the annual number of responses multiplied by the reporting burden per response.)

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Done in Washington, DC, this 22nd day of February 2002.

W. Ron DeHaven,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 02–4807 Filed 2–27–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. 02–009–1]

Fruit Fly Cooperative Control Program; Record of Decision Based on Final Environmental Impact Statement—2001

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice advises the public of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's record of decision for the Fruit Fly Cooperative Control Program final environmental impact statement.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the record of decision and the final environmental impact statement on which the record of decision is based are available for public inspection at USDA, room 1141, South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 690–2817 before coming. The documents may also be viewed on the Internet at *http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ppd/es/ppq/fffeis.pdf.*

Copies of the record of decision and the final environmental impact statement may be obtained from:

Environmental Services, PPD, APHIS, USDA, 4700 River Road Unit 149, Riverdale, MD 20737–1237; (301) 734–6742; Western Regional Office, PPQ, APHIS, USDA, 1629 Blue Spruce, Suite 204, Ft. Collins, CO 80524; or

Eastern Regional Office, PPQ, APHIS, USDA, 920 Main Campus, Suite 200, Raleigh, NC 27606–5202.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Harold Smith, Environmental ProtectionOfficer, Environmental Services, PPD, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 149, Riverdale, MD 20737–1237; (301) 734–6742.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice advises the public that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) has prepared a record of decision based on the Fruit Fly Cooperative Control Program final environmental impact statement. This record of decision has been prepared in accordance with: (1) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), (2) regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), (3) USDA regulations implementing NEPA (7 CFR part 1), and (4) APHIS' NEPA Implementing Procedures (7 CFR part 372).

The Agency record of decision is set forth below.

Record of Decision; Fruit Fly Cooperative Control Program; Final Environmental Impact Statement—2001

Decision

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) has prepared a final environmental impact statement (EIS) for its Fruit Fly Cooperative Control Program. The EIS analyzed alternatives for control of various exotic fruit fly pests that threaten United States agricultural and environmental resources. After considering fully the analysis presented in the EIS (including supportive documents cited or incorporated by reference), I have accepted the findings of the EIS.

The selection of alternatives for individual future fruit fly programs will be on an individual basis, made only after site-specific assessment of the individual program areas. The selection of an alternative (and its associated control methods) will consider the findings of the EIS, the site-specific assessment, the public response, and any other relevant information available to APHIS at the time. APHIS will conduct environmental monitoring, and prepare environmental monitoring plans that are specific to each program, which will describe the purpose of the monitoring and the nature of the samples to be collected and analyzed. Also, APHIS will implement an emergency response communication plan for each future program that has been designed to reduce risk to the public. I have determined that this course of action includes all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from fruit fly control measures that may be employed by APHIS in future fruit fly control programs.

Alternatives Considered

The alternatives considered within the EIS include: No action, a nonchemical program, and an integrated program (the preferred alternative). The integrated program alternative includes both nonchemical and chemical component methods. The alternatives are broad in scope and reflect the major choices that must be made for future programs. In addition to control methods, the action alternatives include exclusion (quarantines and inspections) and detection and prevention (including sterile insect technique) methods. The EIS considered and compared the potential impacts of the alternatives as well as their component control methods.

Decisional Background

In arriving at this decision, I have considered pertinent risk analyses, chemical background statements, information on endangered and threatened species, and other technical documents whose analyses and conclusions were integrated into and summarized within the EIS. I have also considered APHIS' responsibilities under various statutes or regulations, the technological feasibilities of the alternatives and control methods, and public perspectives relative to environmental issues. Although scientific controversy may exist relative to the severity of potential impacts, especially with regard to pesticide impacts, I am satisfied that APHIS has estimated correctly the impacts of alternatives for fruit fly control.

APHIS understands the potential consequences of control methods (especially chemical control methods) used for fruit fly control. Chemical control methods have greater potential for direct adverse environmental consequences than nonchemical control methods. Chemical pesticides have the potential to adversely affect human health, nontarget species, and physical components of the environment. APHIS fully appreciates the dangers pesticides may pose, especially to sensitive members of communities, and consequently has made a significant effort to research and develop the use of newer, less harmful pesticides. One such pesticide, the microbially produced biological insecticide spinosad, shows great promise and will be used as a direct replacement for malathion where possible in future fruit fly programs.

APHIS is committed to the rational use of chemical pesticides and strives to reduce their use wherever possible. However, APHIS has statutory obligations that require it to act decisively to eliminate foreign fruit fly pests that invade our country. Given the current state of control technology, we believe that nonchemical control methods (used exclusively) are not capable of eradicating most fruit fly species. We know too that the net result of a decision not to use chemicals would be that other government entities or commercial growers would be likely to use even more chemicals over a wider area, with correspondingly greater environmental impact. APHIS is convinced that coordinated and well-run government programs that limit the use of pesticides to the minimum necessary to do the job are in the best interests of the public and the environment. APHIS continues to support and favor the use of integrated pest management strategies for control of fruit fly pests.

Final Implementation

In all cases, a site-specific assessment will be made prior to the time a decision is made on the control methods that will be used on a particular program. That

assessment will consider characteristics such as unique and sensitive aspects of the program area, applicable environmental and program documentation, and applicable new developments in environmental science or control technologies. The site-specific assessment will also confirm the adequacy or need for additional program mitigative measures. Site-specific assessments will be made available to the public, and APHIS will consider the public's perspective relative to individual programs.

To avoid or minimize environmental harm, APHIS will implement appropriate risk reduction strategies, as described in chapter VI of the EIS. These strategies are fully described in the EIS and include but are not limited to the following: Pesticide applicat or certification, training and applicator orientation, special pesticide handling, precautions for pesticide application, identification of sensitive sites, public notification procedures, and interagency coordination and consultation.

(The record of decision was signed by Richard L. Dunkle, Deputy Administrator, Plant Protection and Quarantine, APHIS, on February 5, 2002.)

Done in Washington, DC, this 22nd day of February 2002.

W. Ron DeHaven,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 02–4806 Filed 2–27–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. 02–006–1]

Monsanto Co.; Availability of Environmental Assessment for Extension of Determination of Nonregulated Status for Canola Genetically Engineered for Glyphosate Herbicide Tolerance

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We are advising the public that an environmental assessment has been prepared for a proposed decision to extend to one additional canola event our determination that a canola line developed by Monsanto Company, which has been genetically engineered for tolerance to the herbicide glyphosate, is no longer considered a regulated article under our regulations governing the introduction of certain genetically engineered organisms. We are making this environmental assessment available to the public for review and comment.

DATES: We will consider all comments we receive that are postmarked, delivered, or e-mailed by April 1, 2002.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by postal mail/commercial delivery or by e-mail. If you use postal mail/commercial delivery, please send four copies of your comment (an original and three copies) to: Docket No. 02–006–1, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3C71, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1238. Please state that your comment refers to Docket No. 02–006–1. If you use e-mail, address your comment to *regulations@aphis.usda.gov.* Your comment must be contained in the body of your message; do not send attached files. Please include your name and address in your message and ''Docket No. 02–006–1'' on the subject line.

You may read the extension request, the environmental assessment, and any comments we receive on this docket in our reading room. The reading room is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 690–2817 before coming.

APHIS documents published in the **Federal Register**, and related information, including the names of organizations and individuals who have commented on APHIS dockets, are available on the Internet at *http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ppd/rad/webrepor.html.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. James White, Plant Protection and Quarantine, APHIS, Suite 5B05, 4700 River Road Unit 147, Riverdale, MD 20737–1236; (301) 734–5940. To obtain a copy of the extension request or the environmental assessment, contact Ms. Kay Peterson at (301) 734–4885; e-mail: *Kay.Peterson@aphis.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The regulations in 7 CFR part 340, ''Introduction of Organisms and Products Altered or Produced Through Genetic Engineering Which Are Plant Pests or Which There is Reason to Believe Are Plant Pests,'' regulate, among other things, the introduction (importation, interstate movement, or release into the environment) of organisms and products altered or produced through genetic engineering that are plant pests or that there is reason to believe are plant pests. Such genetically engineered organisms and products are considered ''regulated articles.''

The regulations in § 340.6(a) provide that any person may submit a petition to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) seeking a determination that an article should not be regulated under 7 CFR part 340. Further, the regulations in § 340.6(e)(2) provide that a person may request that APHIS extend a determination of nonregulated status to other organisms. Such a request must include information to establish the similarity of the antecedent organism and the regulated article in question.

Background

On November 20, 2001, APHIS received a request for an extension of a determination of nonregulated status (APHIS No. 01–324–01p) from Monsanto Company (Monsanto) of St. Louis, MO, for a canola (*Brassica napus* L.) transformation event designated as glyphosate-tolerant canola event GT200 (GT200), which has been genetically engineered for tolerance to the herbicide glyphosate. The Monsanto request seeks an extension of a determination of nonregulated status that was issued for Roundup Ready® canola line RT73, the antecedent organism, in response to APHIS petition number 98–216–01p (see 64 FR 5628–5629, Docket No. 98–089–2, published February 4, 1999). Based on the similarity of GT200 to the antecedent organism RT73, Monsanto requests a determination that glyphosate-tolerant canola event GT200 does not present a plant pest risk and, therefore, is not a regulated article under APHIS' regulations in 7 CFR part 340.

Analysis

Like the antecedent organism, canola event GT200 has been genetically engineered to express an enzyme, 5-enolpyruvylshikimate-3-phosphate synthase (EPSPS), from *Agrobacterium* sp. strain CP4, and the glyphosate oxidoreductase (GOX) gene/protein from *Ochrobactrum anthropi* strain LBAA, both of which impart tolerance to the herbicide glyphosate. The subject canola and the antecedent organism were produced through use of the *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* method to transform the parental canola variety Westar. Expression of the added genes in GT200 and the antecedent organism is controlled in part by gene sequences derived from the plant pathogen figwort mosaic virus.

Canola event GT200 and the antecedent organism were genetically