services from the land (ROD pg 7). Under the plan, an estimated 91 million board feet (MMBF) of salvage harvest may be produced from the 11 national forests annually (ROD–11). This project will contribute approximately 5 MMBF to these expectations.

The proposed activities are consistent with the Sierra National Forest LRMP, as amended, and the Willow Creek Landscape Ecosystem Analysis.

Preliminary Alternatives to the Proposed Action

To comply with NEPA, the Forest Service will evaluate alternatives to the proposed action within the EIS, including No Action and other alternatives responding to public comments. Each alternative will be rigorously explored and evaluated, or rationale will be given for eliminating an alternative from detailed study. A range of alternatives may be considered.

Responsible Official

The Responsible Deciding Official is James L. Boynton, Forest Supervisor, Sierra National Forest, 1600 Tollhouse Rd., Clovis, CA 93612.

Public Involvement

The public will be invited to participate in the scoping process, and review of the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS). Comments from the public and other agencies will be used in preparation of the DEIS. No public meetings are planned. The draft environmental impact statement is expected to be available for public review and comment in September 2002 and a final environmental impact statement in November 2002. The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**. It is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate at that time. To be most helpful, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible and may address the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed (see The Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3).

Comments received in response to this solicitation, including names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposed action and will be available for public inspection. Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered; however, those who submit anonymous comments will not have standing to appeal the subsequent decision under 36 CFR 215.

Additionally, pursuant to 7 CFR 1.27(d), any person may request the agency to withhold a submission from the public record by showing how the Freedom of Information (FOIA) permits such confidentiality. Persons requesting such confidentiality should be awarded that, under the FOIA, confidentiality may be granted in only very limited circumstances, such as to protect trade secrets. The Forest Service will inform the requester of the agency's decision regarding the request for confidentiality, and where the request is denied, the agency will return the submission and notify the requester that the comments may be resubmitted with or without name and address.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts the agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* v. *NRDC, 435 U.S. 519,553 (1978).* Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental impact statement stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental state may be viewed or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon* v. *Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc.* v. *Harris,* 490F. Supp. 1334 (E.D. Wis 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45 day comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Dated: June 5, 2002.

James L. Boynton,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 02–14898 Filed 6–12–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Forest Counties Payments Committee

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting and extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Forest Counties Payments Committee will meet in Washington, DC, on July 10, 2002. The purpose of the meeting is to receive comments from both elected officials and the general public on the recommendations the Committee must make to Congress as specified in Section 320 of the Fiscal Year 2001 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. The meeting will consist of a business session, which is open to public attendance, from 9 a.m. to 12 noon and a public input session from 1 p.m. until 5 p.m. This notice also provides an extension of the comment period associated with the Forest Counties Payments Committee notices published in the **Federal Register** on February 4, 2002 (67 FR 5087), March 26, 2002 (67 FR 13748), and on May 6, 2002 (67 FR 30353).

DATES: The Washington, DC, meeting will be held on July 10, 2002. Persons who are interested in providing comments to the Committee, including those who attended or have an interest in the meetings in Reno, Nevada, and Rapid City, South Dakota, identified in the preceding **SUMMARY**, have until July 31, 2002, to submit their written comments. Comments received after this date will be considered to the extent possible.

ADDRESSES: The July 10 meeting will be held at the Holiday Inn on the Hill, 415 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC. Those who cannot be present may submit written responses to the questions listed in **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** in this notice to Randle G. Phillips, Executive Director, Forest Counties Payments Committee, P.O. Box 34718, Washington, DC 20043–4713, or electronically at the Committee's website at *http://countypayments.gov/comments.html.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randle G. Phillips, Executive Director, Forest Counties Payments Committee, (202) 208–6574 or via e-mail at *rphillips01@fs.fed.us.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 320 of the 2001 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–291) created the Forest Counties Payments Committee to make recommendations to Congress on a long-term solution for making Federal payments to eligible States and counties in which Federal lands are situated. To formulate its recommendations to Congress, the Committee will consider the impact on eligible States and counties of revenues from the historic multiple use of Federal lands; evaluate the economic, environmental, and social benefits which accrue to counties containing Federal lands; evaluate the expenditures by counties on activities occurring on Federal lands which are Federal responsibilities; and monitor payments and implementation of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393).

At the July 10 meeting in Washington, DC, the Committee asks that elected officials and others who wish to comment provide information in response to the following questions:

1. Do counties receive their fair share of Federal revenue-sharing payments made to eligible States?

2. What difficulties exist in complying with and managing all of the Federal revenue-sharing payments programs? Are some more difficult than others?

3. What economic, social, and environmental costs do counties incur as a result of the presence of public lands within their boundaries?

4. What economic, social, and environmental benefits do counties realize as a result of public lands within their boundaries?

5. What are the economic and social effects from changes in revenues generated from public lands over the past 15 years as a result of changes in management on public lands in your State or county?

6. What actions has your State or county taken to mitigate any impacts associated with declining economic conditions or revenue-sharing payments?

7. What effects, both positive and negative, have taken place with education and highway programs that are attributable to the management of public lands within your State or county?

8. What relationship, if any, should exist between Federal revenue-sharing programs, and management activities on public lands?

9. What alternatives exist to provide equitable revenue-sharing to States and counties and to promote ''sustainable forestry?''

10. What has been your experience regarding implementation of Public Law 106–393, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act?

11. What changes in law, policies and procedures, and the management of public land have contributed to changes in revenue derived from the multiple-use management of these lands?

12. What changes in law, policies and procedures, and the management of public land are needed in order to restore the revenues derived from the multiple-use management of these lands?

Dated: June 6, 2002.

George D. Lennon,

Acting Deputy Chief.

[FR Doc. 02–14860 Filed 6–12–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–P

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY: Commission on Civil Rights.

DATE AND TIME: Friday, June 21, 2002, 9:30 a.m.

PLACE: 400 S.E. Second Avenue, Tuttle Room, Miami, FL 33131

STATUS: Open to the public.

Agenda

I. Approval of Agenda
II. Approval of Minutes of May 17, 2002 Meeting
III. Announcements
IV. Staff Director's Report
V. State Advisory Committee Appointments for Florida and Kentucky
VI. State Advisory Committee Report
- Barriers Facing Minority- and Women-Owned Businesses in Pennsylvania (Pennsylvania)

VII. Future Agenda Items
10:30 a.m. Briefing: Voting Rights in Florida 2002: The Impact of the Commission's Report and the Florida Election Reform Act of 2002 (Thursday, June 20, 2002)

Debra Carr,

Deputy General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 02–15041 Filed 6–11–02; 10:32 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[I.D. 061002A]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Title: Fishing Capacity Reduction Program Buyback Requests.

Form Number(s): None.

OMB Approval Number: 0648–0376.

Type of Request: Regular submission.

Burden Hours: 38,563.

Number of Respondents: 878.

Average Hours Per Response: 6,634 hours for a business plan; 4 hours for a referenda vote; 4 hours for an invitation to bid; 10 minutes to submit a fish ticket; 2 hours for a monthly buyer report; 4 hours for an annual buyer report; 2 hours for a seller/buyer report; 270 hours for a state approval of plans and amendments to state fishery management plan; and 1 hour for advising of any holder or owner claims that conflict with accepted bidders' representations about reduction permit ownership or reduction vessel ownership.

Needs and Uses: NMFS has established a program to reduce excess fishing capacity by paying fishermen (1) to surrender their fishing permits or (2) both surrender their permits and either scrap their vessels or restrict vessel titles to prevent fishing. NMFS proposes to add a provision which would allow the public 30 days to advise of any holder or owner claims that conflict with accepted bidders' representations about reduction permit ownership or reduction vessel ownership, and to merge requirements currently cleared under OMB Control Number 0648–0413.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations, individuals or households, and State, Local, or Tribal Government.

Frequency: On occasion, monthly, annually.

Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.

OMB Desk Officer: David Rostker, (202) 395–3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Madeleine Clayton, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, (202) 482–3129, Department of Commerce, Room 6086, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington,