FSA State Office	Sign-up request
Total	1,550

Section 8(c)(2) of the Act, provides that following a sign-up period, USDA shall conduct a referendum upon the request of 10 percent or more of the number of cotton producers and importers voting in the most recent referendum (1991). This would require 10 percent or 4,622 (46,220×.10=4,622) of the 46,220 valid ballots cast by cotton producers and importers in the July 1991 referendum. It is further provided that, in counting such request not more than 20 percent or 924 may be from producers from any one state or importers of cotton.

USDA finds that the results of the sign-up period did not meet the criteria requiring a continuance referendum by the Act. USDA bases this determination on the fact that the 1,550 requests received during the sign-up period is less than the 4,622 required.

Background

The 1991 amendments to the Order (7 CFR 1205 *et seq.*) were implemented following the July 1991 referendum. The 1990 amendments were provided for in the Act (7 U.S.C. 2101–2118). These amendments provided for: (1) Importer representation on the Cotton Board by an appropriate number of persons, to be determined by USDA, who import cotton or cotton products into the U.S. and whom USDA selects from nominations submitted by importer organization certified by USDA; (2) assessments levied on imported cotton and cotton products at a rate determined in the same manner as for U.S. cotton; (3) increasing the amount USDA can be reimbursed for the conduct of a referendum from $200,000 to $300,000; (4) reimbursing government agencies that assist in administering the collection of assessments on imported cotton and cotton products; and (5) terminating the right of producers to demand a refund of assessments.

On July 9, 1991, (56 FR 31289) AMS issued a proposal to amend the Order to determine if a majority, 50 percent or more, of producers and importers favored implementation of the proposed amendments to the Order. USDA conducted a referendum (July 1991) among persons who had been cotton producers or cotton importers during a representative period.

Results of the July 1991 referendum showed that of the 46,220 valid ballots received; 27,879 or 60 percent of the persons voting favored the amendments to the Order and 18,341 or 40 percent opposed the amendments.

Following the July 1991 referendum, AMS implemented the amendments. In addition to the previously discussed amendments to the Act and Order, USDA is required by section 8(c)(1) to: (1) Conduct a review once every five years after the anniversary date of the referendum implementing the 1990 Act amendments to determine whether a referendum is necessary and (2) make public the results of such a review within 60 days after each fifth anniversary date of the 1991 implementing referendum. Should the review indicate that a referendum is needed USDA is directed to conduct the referendum within 12 months after a public announcement of review results.

Should the review indicate that a referendum is not warranted, section 8(c)(2) includes provisions for producers and importers to request a continuance referendum through a sign-up period.

Pursuant to the Act, on October 8, 1996, USDA issued the results of the first five-year review of the Cotton Research and Promotion Program. USDA announced its view not to conduct a referendum regarding the 1991 amendments to the Order (61 FR 52772). From January 15 though April 14, 1997, USDA conducted a sign-up period for all eligible persons to request a continuance referendum on the 1990 Act amendments. The results of the sign-up period did not meet the criteria as established by the Act for a continuance referendum and, therefore, a referendum was not conducted.

On January 14, 2002, USDA issued the results of the second five-year review on the Cotton Research and Promotion Program (67 FR 1714). The report describes the impact of the Cotton Research and Promotion Program on the cotton industry and the views of those receiving its benefits. The review report cited that the 1990 amendments to the Act were successfully implemented and are operating as intended. The report also noted that there is a general consensus within the cotton industry that the Cotton Research and Promotion Program and the 1990 amendments to the Act are operating as intended. Written comments, economic data, and results from two independent evaluations supported this conclusion. Industry comments cited examples how the additional funding has yielded benefits by increasing the demand and consumption for cotton. Based on the findings of the report, USDA found no compelling reason to conduct a referendum regarding the 1990 Act amendments to the Order although some program participants supported a referendum.

If USDA does not provide for such a referendum on its own initiative, the Act provides that USDA shall conduct such a referendum upon the request of 10 percent or more of the number of cotton producers and importers voting in the most recent referendum. This would be accomplished through a sign-up period conducted by USDA. Determination of the procedures for the conduct of the sign-up period was announced prior to the start of the sign-up period in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 21167).

With this announcement of the results of the sign-up period, USDA has completed all requirements set forth in section 8(c) (1) and (2) of the Act regarding the review of the Cotton Research and Promotion Program to determine if a continuance referendum is warranted. A referendum will not be conducted, and no further actions are planned in connection with this review.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 2101–2118.

Dated: October 29, 2002.

A.J. Yates,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 02–27990 Filed 11–1–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food Safety and Inspection Service

[Docket No. 02–035C]

Codex Alimentarius: Meeting of the Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems

AGENCY: Food Safety and Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice; correction.

SUMMARY: The Food Safety and Inspection Service published a document in the **Federal Register** on October 2, 2002, in FR Doc. Number 02–24978 on page 61847, concerning announcement of public meetings. The document contained an incorrect date.

The date for the second public meeting was incorrect. The **DATES** caption should be corrected to read:

"DATES: The public meetings are scheduled for Tuesday, October 22, 2002 from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. and Tuesday, November 19, 2002 from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m."

Done at Washington, DC on October 29, 2002.

F. Edward Scarbrough,

U.S. Manager for Codex Alimentarious.

[FR Doc. 02–27848 Filed 11–1–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–DM–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Modoc National Forest; California; Modoc National Forest Noxious Weed Strategy Implementation Project

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Revision of notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement published at 63 FR 20375, April 24, 1998.

SUMMARY: This environmental analysis focuses on the planning and control element of the Modoc National Forest Noxious Weed Strategy. Physical treatment and herbicide application will be analyzed, other elements identified in the strategy are very important aspects of the Forest weed program, but environmental analysis and documentation are not required to implement those activities. An Integrated Weed Management (IWM) approach was used to determine treatment methods for all known noxious weed occurrences. Treatment will occur to noxious weeds spread geographically over <1% of the Forest, at known infestation sites, by a variety of treatment methods. Sites planned for treatment range in size from single plants to infestations covering up to 1,500 acres. Actual treatment would not exceed 1,500 acres per year.

Physical treatment includes hand pulling, digging, and grubbing. These treatments will be applied within 10 feet of streams and other water features or to small, isolated populations of 100 plants or less where mechanical treatments can be effective.

Herbicide application will occur directly to weed leaves and stems. Two types of foliar applications will be used: *Spot applicators* —herbicide is sprayed directly onto target plants only; other desirable plants are avoided. These applicators include motorized rigs with spray hoses, backpack sprayers, and hand-pumped spray or spray bottles that can target very small plants or parts of plants, and *Wick (wipe-on) applicators* —A sponge or wick on a handle wipes herbicide onto weed foliage and stems. The wick generally prevents drift or droplets from falling onto non-target plants and soil.

All herbicides proposed for use are registered in the U.S. and California and have a label certifying that the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) have approved the chemical for use. No biological control or aerial spraying of herbicides is planned in the proposed action. Implementation would begin in the spring and summer following the decision and extend for a period of at least 5 years.

DATES: The draft environmental impact statement is expected November 29, 2002, and the final environmental impact statement is expected January 31, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Kathleen Jordan, Acting Forest Supervisor, Modoc National Forest, Supervisor's Office 800 W. 12th, Alturas, CA 96101 (*kjordan@fs.fed.us*).

For further information, mail correspondence to Irene Davidson, Project Team Leader, Modoc National Forest, Supervisor's Office 800 W. 12th, Alturas, CA 96101 (*idavidson@fs.fed.us*).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Irene Davidson, Project Team Leader, Modoc National Forest, Supervisor's Office 800 W. 12th, Alturas, CA 96101 (*idavidson@fs.fed.us*).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The electronic copy of the draft environmental impact statement can be viewed at the Modoc National Forest Planning page: *http://www.r5.fs.fed.us/modoc/management/nepa/nepa.html.*

Purpose and Need for Action

This environmental impact statement (EIS) is the site-specific decision level for implementing treatment activities identified in the Modoc National Forest Noxious Weed Strategy. This strategy was prepared to tier to the Forest Service National and Regional strategies that are currently in place to address key elements of a comprehensive weed program. The Forest completed a Noxious and Invasive Plant Strategy in 2002. The Forest is directed to develop and implement weed programs and work cooperatively with other Federal, State, and local agencies and groups in the Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2801, *et seq.*), FSM Direction (FSM 2080), the Modoc Land and Resource Management Plan (MLRMP), and Presidential Executive Order #13112. Forest Service regulation at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 222.8 acknowledges the Agency's obligation to work cooperatively in identifying noxious weed problems and developing control programs in areas where NFS lands are located.

The objectives of implementing the proposed treatment activities through the Modoc National Forest Noxious Weed Strategy Implementation Project are to:

- Protect the ecosystem function and biodiversity of the Modoc by preventing the continued spread of non-native noxious and invasive plant species.
- Prevent the spread of established non-native noxious and invasive plants into areas containing little or no infestation.
- Eradicate new invaders (non-native noxious and invasive plant species not previously reported in the area) before they become established.
- Eradicate or control known non-native noxious and invasive plant infestations in areas that are considered infestation pathways for the establishment and movement of these plants on the Modoc (roads, trails, streams, intensely burned areas).

On the Forest, the numbers of exotic invasive plant species and areas infested are relatively small compared to other parts of the west. There are still opportunities to prevent extensive weed infestation and spread if aggressive, consistent treatment is employed. The species of highest priority for treatment (*e.g.* the knapweeds, yellow starthistle, Dalmatian toadflax) are in relatively small, scattered populations on the scale of hundreds of gross acres.

Prevention is recognized as the best, most cost-effective strategy, but once infestation has occurred, actions must be taken to prevent further establishment and spread of the alien species. As discussed below, treatments are a part of a larger overall strategy. Noxious weeds and invasive exotic plants are an increasing threat to the function, composition, and structure of native ecosystems.

All ecosystems (rangelands, forests, grasslands, riparian areas, wetlands, lakes, and streams) are vulnerable to invasion by non-native weed species. Noxious weeds and invasive exotic plants are a serious biodiversity issue of great significance to human and natural resource conditions on the Modoc National Forest (Forest). Noxious weeds have traditionally been considered primarily rangeland and agricultural problems in the western United States.

Aggressive noxious weed species often out-compete native plants for water, nutrients, sunlight, and space. Many species contain chemical compounds that prevent other plant seeds from germinating (allelopathic) at the same site. When noxious weeds dominate sites, the composition, structure, and function of the entire ecological community is altered. Weed