

Individual consumers will be informed of these confidentiality assurances in the precollection letters. Participants will be awarded an incentive which will be an emergency or travel pack for their automobile (value estimated around \$12) for each collection. The pack will not display a company endorsement, but will display a USDA logo. The choice of a similar product equal to or slightly higher in value will be offered as a choice for the second collection.

*Estimate of Burden:* For the fluoride survey in this study, burden on the respondents will consist of completing the questionnaire along with collection of water samples in two bottles supplied by NDL. The total time for survey completion and water collection is estimated to take 30 minutes or less.

*Respondents:* Randomly selected consumers in the U.S. public within statistically defined areas (Census-based).

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 144 in total, each participating in the information and water collection twice over a 3–6 month period.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:*  $144 \times 30 \text{ minutes} \times 2 \text{ collections} = 144 \text{ hours}$  of time and effort across the U.S. contributed to this collection of tap water.

*Comments:* 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 the assumptions made; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on the respondents, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technology. Comments should be sent to the address in the preamble. All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: January 31, 2002.

**Phyllis Johnson,**

*Director, Beltsville Area Research Center.*  
[FR Doc. 02–7148 Filed 3–25–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–03–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Forest Counties Payments Committee

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Counties Payments Committee has scheduled a meeting on April 20, 2002, to discuss how it will provide Congress with the information specified in Section 320 of the Fiscal Year 2001 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. In order to develop its recommendations to Congress, the Committee would like to hear from both elected officials and the general public. The meeting will consist of a public input session from 1 p.m. until 5 p.m.  
**DATES:** The meeting will be held on April 20, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held in the Silver Baron "D" meeting room on the mezzanine level at the Silver Legacy Casino/Resort, 407 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nevada.

Those who cannot be present may submit written responses to the questions listed under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** in this notice to Randle G. Phillips, Executive Director, Forest Counties Payments Committee, PO Box 34718, Washington, DC 20043–4713, or electronically to the Committee's website at <http://countypayments.gov/comments.html>. Comments on this notice must be received by April 30, 2002, to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent possible.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Randle G. Phillips, Executive Director, Forest Counties Payments Committee, (202) 208–6574 or [rphillips01@fs.fed.us](mailto:rphillips01@fs.fed.us).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 320 of the 2001 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (Pub. L. 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. 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 (Pub. L. 106–393).

At the April 20 meeting in Reno, the Committee asks that respondents provide information that is responsive 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 of 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 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: March 19, 2002.

**Scott D. Conroy,**

*Acting Deputy Chief, Programs and Legislation.*

[FR Doc. 02–7241 Filed 3–25–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–11–P**