AI–3 ''Contribute to the establishment and strengthening of scientific and technical networks;'' and

RT–3 ''Facilitate the development of regional analyses, transboundary partnerships, actions, and monitoring.''

16. *The Strategic Plan should include evaluation of pesticide effects on biodiversity.* The Responding to Threats (RT) section of the Strategic Plan, in particular RT–3, identifies threats associated with pesticide use as a Priority Area for Action. In addition, cross-program coordination with the CEC's Sound Management of Chemicals (SMOC) program will also aid in evaluating these effects on biodiversity. Such cross-program coordination within the CEC is being discussed as an important management tool and the United States BCWG supports this type of coordination.

17. *The Strategic Plan should include an evaluation of global warming and climate change effects on biodiversity.* United States climate change policy is in the hands of dedicated specialized national negotiating teams outside the scope of our nation's BCWG. More significantly, the CEC budget is not adequate to address the complexity of this topic. Other international fora are more appropriate to address the climate change subject. For example, a task force to the Convention for Biological Diversity is examining the effects of climate change on biodiversity. The United States BCWG recognizes the possible effects that changes in climate might generate, but agreed that this topic should be addressed through other international conventions.

18. *The Strategic Plan should support work on invasive species and link to the CEC's Law and Policy Program.* The United States BCWG acknowledges commenter's appreciation for the inclusion of invasive species in the Strategic Plan. Invasive species will be an important focus for the CEC. We also agree that it is desirable to link management activities to address threats from invasive species through coordination with CEC's other programs.

19. *The Strategic Plan should address loss and degradation of habitat, specifically due to oil and gas development.* The threat of oil and gas development is partly addressed in Priority Area for Action RT–3 (''Facilitate the development of regional analyses, transboundary partnerships, actions, and monitoring that will address the problems caused by the release of substances to land, air and water in North America as they impact important habitats and migratory and transboundary species, and facilitate the development of recovery actions in a collaborative fashion.''). In addition, oil and gas development concerns may also be address under RT–1 (''Support and promote trinational or regional efforts to identify threats facing North American ecosystems, habitats, and species; and establish priorities for responding to these threats.''). The United States BCWG appreciates the commenter's perspective on this topic.

20. *The Strategic Plan neglects agricultural policy and its effects of trade policy.* Given the finite resources and the CEC's fixed budget, it may be desirable to not commit to every complex policy issue available. Agricultural policy, often contentious among governments, even without factoring in environmental aspects, is a complex arena. The CEC may be stretched to address this sensitive and dynamic landscape of issues in which its impact may be constrained. It may be difficult to influence each party's domestic agricultural policy. It may be impossible to alter trinational agricultural policies. However, there is room in the Strategic Plan, and through linkages with other CEC programs to examine agricultural policy effects on the environment. Considerations of agricultural policy potentially fit into the Biodiversity Conservation and Trade goal (BT 1–5). The CEC Environment, Economy, and Trade program, which has invested in analyses of the environmental effects of the trade liberalization, is a logical linkage for this subject.

21. *Analyze the importance of the effects of trade on North American Biodiversity.* The United States BCWG appreciates interest in evaluations of the impacts of Trade on biodiversity. We draw the commenter's attention to CEC's report titled: ''The Environmental Effects of Free Trade,'' *http://cec.org/pubs_docs/scope/index.cfm?varlan=english&ID=14, http://cec.org/files/PDF/ECONOMY/111–03–05_en.pdf.* The CEC has already been working on this issue, albeit in general terms as far as the parameters representing the environment. It is difficult to extract the effects of trade liberalization from multiple alternative social, economic, and environmental factors that also influence biodiversity. Also, biodiversity has not been quantified in adequate detail or scale to allow rigorous regional evaluations, which forces investigators to rely on extremely broad indices. The CEC's Conservation of Biodiversity Program will coordinate closely with the Environment, Economy, and Trade Program to address this multivariate and important topic.

Access to the Document: The Strategic Plan may be viewed on the CEC's Web site at: *http://www.cec.org/programs_projects/conserv_biodiv.* Copies of the Strategic Plan may be obtained by contacting Patrick Cotter via mail at: Office of International Affairs (2260R), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460; via fax at (202) 565–2409; or via e-mail at *Cotter.Patrick@epa.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick Cotter by telephone at (202) 564–6414 or by e-mail at *Cotter.Patrick@epa.gov.*

C. Thomas McCully,

Acting Assistant Administrator for International Affairs.

[FR Doc. 04–2713 Filed 2–6–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7619–6]

Integrating Ecological Risk Assessment and Economic Analysis in Watersheds: a Conceptual Approach and Three Case Studies

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of a final report titled, Integrating Ecological Risk Assessment and Economic Analysis in Watersheds: a Conceptual Approach and Three Case Studies (EPA/600/R–03/140R), which was prepared by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Center for Environmental Assessment (NCEA) of the Office of Research and Development (ORD).

ADDRESSES: The document will be made available electronically through the NCEA Web site (*http://www.epa.gov/ncea*). A limited number of paper copies will be available from the EPA's National Service Center for Environmental Publications (NSCEP), PO Box 42419, Cincinnati, OH 45242; telephone: 1–800–490–9198 or 513–489–8190; facsimile: 513–489–8695. Please provide your name, your mailing address, the title and the EPA number of the requested publication.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Technical Information Staff, National Center for Environmental Assessment/Cincinnati Office (MS–117), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 26 W. Martin Luther King Drive, Cincinnati, OH 56428; Telephone: 513–

569–7257; fax: 513–569–7475; e-mail: *nceadc.comment@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This document reports on a program of research to investigate the integration of ecological risk assessment (ERA) and economics, with an emphasis on the watershed as the scale for analysis. In 1993, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency initiated watershed ERA (W–ERA) in five watersheds to evaluate the feasibility and utility of this approach. In 1999, economic case studies were funded in conjunction with three of those W–ERAs: the Big Darby Creek watershed in central Ohio, the Clinch Valley (Clinch and Powell River watersheds) in southwestern Virginia and northeastern Tennessee, and the central Platte River floodplain in Nebraska. The ecological settings, and the analytical approaches used, differed among the three locations, but each study introduced economists to the ERA process and required the interpretation of ecological risks in economic terms. A workshop was held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 2001 to review progress on those studies, to discuss environmental problems involving other watershed settings, and to discuss the ideal characteristics of a generalized approach for conducting studies of this type. Based on the workshop results, a conceptual approach for the integration of ERA and economic analysis in watersheds was developed. The objectives of this document (by chapter) are: to set forth the rationale, limitations, and contributions of the document (Chapter 1); to create a context for understanding by a diverse, technical audience (Chapter 2); to present a conceptual approach for integrating ERA and economics in the context of watershed management (Chapter 3); to present and critically evaluate the methods and findings of the three watershed case studies (Chapters 4–6); and to identify research needed to improve the integration of ERA and economic analysis in watersheds (Chapter 7). This report is unique in its focus on the problem of ERA-economic integration and the watershed management context and in its presentation of case studies. The conceptual approach is used as a basis of discussion of each case study to illustrate how its particular methodological advances and insights could be used to fullest advantage, both in the watershed studied and in future integration efforts.

Dated: January 28, 2004.

Peter W. Preuss,

Director, National Center for Environmental Assessment.

[FR Doc. 04–2714 Filed 2–6–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPPT–2004–0072]; FRL–7344–2]

Certain New Chemicals; Receipt and Status Information

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Section 5 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) requires any person who intends to manufacture (defined by statute to include import) a new chemical (i.e., a chemical not on the TSCA Inventory) to notify EPA and comply with the statutory provisions pertaining to the manufacture of new chemicals. Under sections 5(d)(2) and 5(d)(3) of TSC, EPA is required to publish a notice of receipt of a premanufacture notice (PMN) or an application for a test marketing exemption (TME), and to publish periodic status reports on the chemicals under review and the receipt of notices of commencement to manufacture those chemicals. This status report, which covers the period from December 26, 2003 to January 16, 2004, consists of the PMNs and TME's both pending or expired, and the notices of commencement to manufacture a new chemical that the Agency has received under TSCA section 5 during this time period.

DATES: Comments identified by the docket ID number OPPT–2004–0072 and the specific PMN number or TME number, must be received on or before March 10, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted electronically, by mail, or through hand delivery/courier. Follow the detailed instructions as provided in Unit I. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.**

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barbara Cunningham, Director, Environmental Assistance Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (7408M), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; telephone number: (202) 554–1404; e-mail address: *TSCA-Hotline@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

This action is directed to the public in general. As such, the Agency has not attempted to describe the specific entities that this action may apply to. Although others may be affected, this action applies directly to the submitter of the premanufacture notices addressed in the 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.**

B. How Can I Get Copies of this Document and Other Related Information?

1. *Docket.* EPA has established an official public docket for this action under docket identification (ID) number OPPT–2004–0072. The official public docket consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, any public comments received, and other information related to this action. Although a part of the official docket, the public docket does not include Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. The official public docket is the collection of materials that is available for public viewing at the EPA Docket Center, Rm. B102-Reading Room, EPA West, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The EPA Docket Center Reading Room telephone number is (202) 566–1744 and the telephone number for the OPPT Docket, which is located in EPA Docket Center, is (202) 566–0280.

2. *Electronic access.* You may access this **Federal Register** document electronically through the EPA Internet under the ''**Federal Register**'' listings at *http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/.*

An electronic version of the public docket is available through EPA's electronic public docket and comment system, EPA Dockets. You may use EPA Dockets at *http://www.epa.gov/edocket/* to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the docket facility identified in Unit I.B.1. Once in the system, select ''search,'' then key in the appropriate docket ID number.

Certain types of information will not be placed in the EPA Dockets.