Cotton events Cry1F and Cry1Ac were developed primarily so that they could be crossed to produce a cotton line which contains both the insecticidal proteins and thereby to maintain a range of effective control options for lepidopteran insect pests and to reduce the potential for the development of resistance to *Bt* insecticides.

Cotton events Cry1F and Cry1Ac have been considered regulated articles under the regulations in 7 CFR part 340 because they contain gene sequences from the plant pathogen Agrobacterium tumefaciens. These cotton events have been field tested since 1999 in the United States under APHIS notifications. In the process of reviewing the notifications for field trials of the subject cotton, APHIS determined that the vectors and other elements were disarmed and that the trials, which were conducted under conditions of reproductive and physical confinement or isolation, would not present a risk of plant pest introduction or dissemination.

In §403 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701-7772), plant pest is defined as any living stage of any of the following that can directly or indirectly injure, cause damage to, or cause disease in any plant or plant product: A protozoan, a nonhuman animal, a parasitic plant, a bacterium, a fungus, a virus or viroid, an infectious agent or other pathogen, or any article similar to or allied with any of the foregoing. APHIS views this definition very broadly. The definition covers direct or indirect injury, disease, or damage not just to agricultural crops, but also to plants in general, for example, native species, as well as to organisms that may be beneficial to plants, for example, honeybees, rhizobia, etc.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is responsible for the regulation of pesticides under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended (7 U.S.C. 136 *et seq.*). FIFRA requires that all pesticides, including herbicides, be registered prior to distribution or sale, unless exempt by EPA regulation. In cases in which genetically modified plants allow for a new use of a pesticide or involve a different use pattern for the pesticide, EPA must approve the new or different use. Accordingly, Mycogen/ Dow has submitted a request to EPA for registration of the stacked Cry1F and Cry1Ac protein construct as a plantincorporated protectant in cotton.

When the use of the pesticide on the genetically modified plant would result in an increase in the residues in a food or feed crop for which the pesticide is currently registered, or in new residues in a crop for which the pesticide is not currently registered, establishment of a new tolerance or a revision of the existing tolerance would be required. Residue tolerances for pesticides are established by EPA under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), as amended (21 U.S.C. 301 *et seq.*), and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) enforces tolerances set by EPA under the FFDCA. Mycogen/Dow has submitted a request to EPA for a tolerance exemption for both the Cry1F and Cry1Ac proteins as expressed in the subject cotton events.

FDA published a statement of policy on foods derived from new plant varieties in the **Federal Register** on May 29, 1992 (57 FR 22984–23005). The FDA statement of policy includes a discussion of FDA's authority for ensuring food safety under the FFDCA, and provides guidance to industry on the scientific considerations associated with the development of foods derived from new plant varieties, including those plants developed through the techniques of genetic engineering. Mycogen/Dow has begun consultation with FDA on the subject cotton events.

To provide the public with documentation of APHIS's review and analysis of the environmental impacts and plant pest risk associated with proposed determinations of nonregulated status for Mycogen/Dow's cotton events Cry1F and Cry1Ac, an environmental assessment has been prepared. The EA was 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 1b), and (4) APHIS's NEPA Implementing Procedures (7 CFR part 372).

In accordance with § 340.6(d) of the regulations, we are publishing this notice to inform the public that APHIS will accept written comments regarding the petitions for determinations of nonregulated status from interested persons for a period of 60 days from the date of this notice. We are also soliciting written comments from interested persons on the environmental assessment prepared to examine any environmental impacts of the proposed determinations for the subject cotton events. The petitions and the environmental assessment and any comments received are available for public review, and copies of the petitions and the environmental assessment are available as indicated in

the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this notice.

After the comment period closes, APHIS will review the data submitted by the petitioner, all written comments received during the comment period, and any other relevant information. After reviewing and evaluating the comments on the petitions and the environmental assessment and other data and information, APHIS will furnish a response to the petitioner, either approving the petitions in whole or in part, or denying the petitions. APHIS will then publish a notice in the Federal Register announcing the regulatory status of the Mycogen/Dow insect-resistant cotton events Cry1F and Cry1Ac and the availability of APHIS's written decision.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1622n and 7701–7772; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

Done in Washington, DC, this 4th day of March, 2004.

#### Kevin Shea,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. [FR Doc. 04–5252 Filed 3–8–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

#### Food and Nutrition Service

## Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Food Stamp Program Regulations, Part 275— Quality Control

**AGENCY:** Food and Nutrition Service, USDA.

#### **ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice invites the general public and other public agencies to comment on a proposed information collection. This notice is an extension of the currently approved information collection burden for the Quality Control (QC) system which includes the sampling plan and the arbitration and good cause processes. The reporting and recordkeeping burdens associated with the Food Stamp Program QC System are approved through August 31, 2004, under OMB No. 0584-0303. Part 275 of the Food Stamp Program regulations on QC requires these burdens. DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before May 10, 2004. ADDRESSES: Send comments and requests for copies of this information collection to: Daniel Wilusz, Chief, Quality Control Branch, Program Accountability Division, Food and

Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 3101 Park Center Drive, Alexandria, VA 22302. You may FAX comments to us at (703) 305–0928 or email at *Daniel.Wilusz@fns.usda.gov*. You may also download an electronic version of this notice at *http:// www.fns.usda.gov/fsp/* and comment via the Internet at the same address. If you do not receive a confirmation from the system that we have received your message, contact us directly at (703) 305–2460.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

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.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection should be directed to Daniel Wilusz, (703) 305–2460 or e-mail at Daniel.Wilusz@fns.usda.gov.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Title:* Food Stamp Program Regulations, Part 275—Quality Control. *OMB Number:* 0584–0303. *Expiration Date:* August 31, 2004.

*Type of Request:* Extension of a currently approved collection of information.

Abstract: There are three components of the QC system that are covered in this proposed information collection. They are: (1) The sampling plan and (2) the arbitration and (3) good cause processes. Each State is required to develop a sampling plan which demonstrates the integrity of its case selection procedures. The QC system is designed to measure each State agency's payment error rate based on a statistically valid sample of food stamp cases. A State's payment error rate represents the proportion of cases that were reported through a QC review as being ineligible, overissued and underissued food stamp benefits. The QC system contains

procedures for resolving differences in review findings between State agencies and FNS. This is referred to as the arbitration process. The QC system also contains procedures which provide relief for State agencies from all or a part of a QC liability when a State agency can demonstrate that a part or all of an excessive error rate was due to an unusual event which had an uncontrollable impact on the State agency's payment error rate. This is referred to as the good cause process.

The approved burden for the QC system includes the burden for the QC sampling plan and the arbitration and good cause processes. The annual reporting burden associated with the QC sampling plan is 265 hours per year. There was a minor increase in the burden due to an increase in the number of responses associated with the good cause process. The annual reporting burdens associated with arbitration and good cause processes are estimated to total 1643 and 8480 respectively. The reporting burden for good cause increased from 1917 to 8480 hours. This is a result of a re-determination in the number of responses from 0.226 to 1 per year. The annual recordkeeping burden associated with the QC sampling plan is 1.25 hours per year. The annual recordkeeping burdens associated with arbitration and good cause processes are estimated to total 3.89 and 1.25 respectively. The recordkeeping burden for good cause increased from .28 to 1.25 hours due a re-determination in the number of records from .226 to 1 per year. The total annual burden for the QC system, as proposed by this notice, increased from 3830 to 10.394 hours.

#### Quality Control System Reporting Burden Associated With the Sampling Plan, Arbitration, and Good Cause

#### 1. Sampling Plan

Affected Public: State agencies. Estimated Number of Respondents: 53.

Estimated Number of Responses Per Respondent: 1.

*Estimated Time Per Response:* 5 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 265.

# 2. Arbitration Process

Affected Public: State agencies. Estimated Number of Respondents: 53.

*Estimated Number of Responses Per Respondent:* 3.1.

*Estimated Time Per Response:* 10 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1643.

## 3. Good Cause Process

*Affected Public:* State agencies. *Estimated Number of Respondents:* 

53. Estimated Number of Responses: 1. Estimated Time Per Response: 160 hours.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 8480.

## Quality Control System Recordkeeping Burden Associated With the Sampling Plan, Arbitration, and Good Cause

1. Sampling Plan

*Estimated Number of Recordkeepers:* 53.

Estimated Number of Records Per Respondent: 1.

Estimated Staff Hours Per

Recordkeeping: .0236. Estimated Total Annual Burden

*Hours:* 1.25.

2. Arbitration Process

*Estimated Number of Recordkeepers:* 53.

Estimated Number of Records Per Respondent: 3.1.

Estimated Staff Hours Per

Recordkeeping: .0236. Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 3.89.

3. Good Cause Process

*Estimated Number of Recordkeepers:* 53.

*Estimated Number of Records:* 1. *Estimated Staff Hours Per* 

Recordkeeping: .0236.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1.25.

The Combined Quality Control System Burden (includes the burdens associated with the Sampling Plan, Arbitration and Good Cause): 10,394 hours.

Dated: March 1, 2004.

#### Roberto Salazar,

Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service. [FR Doc. 04–5199 Filed 3–8–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3410–30–P

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

# **Forest Service**

# Revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan for the Colville, Okanogan and Wenatchee National Forests, Pacific Northwest Region, WA

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA. **ACTION:** Notice of intent to revise the Land and Resource Management Plans (Forest Plans) for the Colville, Okanogan and Wenatchee National Forests.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the intent of the Colville, Okanogan and