

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food and Nutrition Service

Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children: Income Eligibility Guidelines

AGENCY: Food and Nutrition Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department announces adjusted income eligibility guidelines to be used by State agencies in determining the income eligibility of persons applying to participate in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC Program). These income eligibility guidelines are to be used in conjunction with the WIC Regulations. **EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 1, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Debra Whitford, Branch Chief, Policy and Program Development Branch, Supplemental Food Programs Division, FNS, USDA, 3101 Park Center Drive, Alexandria, Virginia 22302, (703) 305-2730.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Executive Order 12866

This notice is exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

This action is not a rule as defined by the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612) and thus is exempt from the provisions of this Act.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

This notice does not contain reporting or recordkeeping requirements subject

to approval by the Office of Management and Budget in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507).

Executive Order 12372

This program is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs under No. 10.557 and is subject to the provisions of Executive Order 12372, which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials (7 CFR Part 3015, Subpart V, 48 FR 29112 June 24, 1983).

Description

Section 17(d)(2)(A) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(d)(2)(A)) requires the Secretary of Agriculture to establish income criteria to be used with nutritional risk criteria in determining a person's eligibility for participation in the WIC Program. The law provides that persons will be income eligible for the WIC Program only if they are members of families that satisfy the income standard prescribed for reduced-price school meals under section 9(b) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)). Under section 9(b), the income limit for reduced-price school meals is 185 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines, as adjusted.

Section 9(b) also requires that these guidelines be revised annually to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. The annual revision for 2002 was published by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) at 67 FR 6931, February 14, 2002. The guidelines published by DHHS are referred to as the poverty guidelines.

Section 246.7(d)(1) of the WIC regulations specifies that State agencies may prescribe income guidelines either equaling the income guidelines established under section 9 of the National School Lunch Act for reduced-price school meals or identical to State or local guidelines for free or reduced-price health care. However, in conforming WIC income guidelines to State or local health care guidelines, the State cannot establish WIC guidelines

which exceed the guidelines for reduced-price school meals, or which are less than 100 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines. Consistent with the method used to compute income eligibility guidelines for reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program, the poverty guidelines were multiplied by 1.85 and the results rounded upward to the next whole dollar.

At this time the Department is publishing the maximum and minimum WIC income eligibility guidelines by household size for the period July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003. Consistent with section 17(f)(17) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)(17)), a State agency may implement the revised WIC income eligibility guidelines concurrently with the implementation of income eligibility guidelines under the Medicaid program established under Title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396, *et seq.*). State agencies may coordinate implementation with the revised Medicaid guidelines, but in no case may implementation take place later than July 1, 2002. State agencies that do not coordinate implementation with the revised Medicaid guidelines must implement the WIC income eligibility guidelines on July 1, 2002. The first table of this notice contains the income limits by household size for the 48 contiguous States, the District of Columbia and all Territories, including Guam. Because the poverty guidelines for Alaska and Hawaii are higher than for the 48 contiguous States, separate tables for Alaska and Hawaii have been included for the convenience of the State agencies. The text of the table showing income eligibility guidelines appears as an appendix at the end of this notice.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 1786

Dated: March 16, 2002.

Ruthie Jackson,

Acting Administrator.

Appendix to Notice—Income Eligibility Guidelines

INCOME ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINES
(Effective from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003)

Household Size	Federal Poverty Guidelines- 100%				Reduced Price Meals - 185%					
	Annual	Monthly	Twice-Monthly	Bi-Weekly	Weekly	Annual	Monthly	Twice-Monthly	Bi-Weekly	Weekly
48 Contiguous States, D.C., Guam and Territories										
Alaska										
1.....	8,860	739	370	341	171	16,391	1,366	683	631	316
2.....	11,940	995	498	460	230	22,089	1,841	921	850	425
3.....	15,020	1,252	626	578	289	27,787	2,316	1,158	1,069	535
4.....	18,100	1,509	755	697	349	33,485	2,791	1,396	1,288	644
5.....	21,180	1,765	883	815	408	39,183	3,266	1,633	1,508	754
6.....	24,260	2,022	1,011	934	467	44,881	3,741	1,871	1,727	864
7.....	27,340	2,279	1,140	1,052	526	50,579	4,215	2,108	1,946	973
8.....	30,420	2,535	1,268	1,170	585	56,277	4,690	2,345	2,165	1,083
Each Add'l Member Add	+3,080	+257	+129	+119	+60	+5,698	+475	+238	+220	+110
Hawaii										
1.....	11,080	924	462	427	214	20,498	1,709	855	789	395
2.....	14,930	1,245	623	575	288	27,621	2,302	1,151	1,063	532
3.....	18,780	1,565	783	723	362	34,743	2,896	1,448	1,337	669
4.....	22,630	1,886	943	871	436	41,866	3,489	1,745	1,611	806
5.....	26,480	2,207	1,104	1,019	510	48,988	4,083	2,042	1,885	943
6.....	30,330	2,528	1,264	1,167	584	56,111	4,676	2,338	2,159	1,080
7.....	34,180	2,849	1,425	1,315	658	63,233	5,270	2,635	2,433	1,217
8.....	38,030	3,170	1,585	1,463	732	70,356	5,863	2,932	2,706	1,353
Each Add'l Member Add	+3,850	+321	+161	+149	+75	+7,123	+594	+297	+274	+137
Hawaii										
1.....	10,200	850	425	393	197	18,870	1,573	787	726	363
2.....	13,740	1,145	573	529	265	25,419	2,119	1,060	978	489
3.....	17,280	1,440	720	665	333	31,968	2,664	1,332	1,230	615
4.....	20,820	1,735	868	801	401	38,517	3,210	1,605	1,482	741
5.....	24,360	2,030	1,015	937	469	45,066	3,756	1,878	1,734	867
6.....	27,900	2,325	1,163	1,074	537	51,615	4,302	2,151	1,986	993
7.....	31,440	2,620	1,310	1,210	605	58,164	4,847	2,424	2,238	1,119
8.....	34,980	2,915	1,458	1,346	673	64,713	5,393	2,697	2,489	1,245
Each Add'l Member Add	+3,540	+295	+148	+137	+69	+6,549	+546	+273	+252	+126

[FR Doc. 02-7757 Filed 3-29-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-30-U

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Mt. Ashland Ski Area Expansion, Rogue River National Forest, Jackson County, OR

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The USDA, Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) to document the analysis and disclose the environmental impacts of a proposal to expand the Mt. Ashland Ski Area (MASA). The project area is located approximately 7 miles south of Ashland, Oregon, within the Siskiyou Mountains in Southern Oregon. The proposed expansion would include construction of two chairlifts, two surface lifts, and approximately 73 acres of associated new ski run terrain primarily within the western half of the Special Use Permit area. There would be an additional 11 acres of clearing for lift corridors, widening of existing runs, and staging areas. In addition, expanded features would include a tubing facility in the southern portion of the permit area; three guest services buildings, a yurt, additional night lighting; additional maintenance access road segments; additional power, water lines and storage tanks, sewer lines; an additional snow fence, and an increase in parking by 220 spaces. Additional watershed restoration projects would be implemented, including structural storm water control, and non-structural controls, such as the placement of coarse woody material. The proposed projects would be implemented and financed by the Mt. Ashland Association (MAA) as soon as possible after Forest Service authorization. Overall completion may take 10 or more years. The agency will give notice of the full environmental analysis and decision making process on the proposed expansion so interested and affected members of the public may participate and contribute in the final decision.

DATES: Additional comments concerning the scope of this analysis should be received by May 3, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Submit additional written comments to Linda Duffy, District Ranger, Ashland Ranger District, Rogue River National Forest, 645 Washington Street, Ashland, Oregon, 97520.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Linda Duffy or Steve Johnson, Ashland Ranger District, Rogue River National Forest, 645 Washington Street, Ashland, Oregon, 97520, Telephone (541) 482-3333; FAX (541) 858-2402.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This site specific EIS will focus on a project proposal for expansion within the existing ski permit area. A draft EIS was released in February 2000, documenting detailed analysis of three alternatives including No-Action. Extraordinary public response on that draft EIS has caused the Forest Service to conduct additional analysis that will result in a new environmental impact statement. The new EIS will result in an analysis that reflects active citizen participation and improves the range of alternatives considered in detail. This process is designed as a continuation of the ongoing environmental analysis and all input previously received will be utilized in the formulation of the new EIS. The stated purpose and need is modified from the February 2000 draft EIS. The proposal, as received from MAA, has also been modified to reflect further refinements that reduce environmental impacts. The environmental analysis will consider and include new information or changed circumstances since the programmatic decision on the "Master Plan" was made in 1991, including an action partially contained within an inventoried roadless area.

In a 1991 Record of Decision (ROD) and final EIS, the Forest Service decided that expanding the Mt. Ashland Ski Area (MASA) was an appropriate use of National Forest System Lands. In this current EIS process, the Forest Service is responding to a modified request (March 2002) by Mt. Ashland Association (MAA) to allow construction of some of the expanded ski facilities programmatically approved in 1991. MAA believes that operations and economic viability at the MASA would be enhanced by construction of proposed new facilities, which are intended to bring the ski area up to date relative to ski industry terrain and safety standards. The Forest Service agrees that this overall need exists and has agreed to consider options for meeting this need. The Forest Service and MAA have cooperatively determined six specific purpose elements for ski area expansion at the MASA at this time. Purpose 1 is terrain balance and diversity, including: develop a balance of terrain by ability level, develop suitable terrain for beginners, provide accessibility of existing lower level terrain, increase terrain for special

programs and competitions, increase diversity of non-traditional terrain, and provide recreational opportunities for non-skiers. Purpose 2 is guest access and circulation including: enhance lift access and skier density, and improve access to facilities. Purpose 3 is update and balance guest services and facilities including: enhance guest experience by updating the quality of existing skier services, and provide additional guest services to improve accessibility. Purpose 4 is skier safety including: enact improvements that provide for and improve user safety. Purpose 5 is economic viability and longevity including: augment and modernize existing facilities to provide an economically viable and stable ski area, and provide a quality recreation experience appealing to the broadest spectrum of the skiing and snowboarding market. Purpose 6 is watershed restoration including: implement restoration projects to maintain or improve the trend of recovering watersheds.

Concurrent with the analysis of the Proposed Action under NEPA, the Forest Service will document several non-significant Forest Plan Amendments to make the Land and Resource Management Plans for the Rogue River and Klamath National Forests, consistent with the decision reached in the 1991 ROD/final EIS.

Based on extensive previous scoping, analysis and public comment received on the February 2000 draft EIS, a preliminary site specific list of project issues has been developed. The significant issue categories that will be used to develop the range of alternatives in the forthcoming draft EIS include: Effects on Water Quality, Effects to Wetlands and Riparian Reserves, Effects to Englemann Spruce, Effects to Mt. Ashland Lupine and Henderson's Horkelia, Effects Associated with Human Social Values, and Effects Associated with Economics.

Based on extensive public input and detailed field survey and analysis conducted by ski area planners, the following five alternatives will be analyzed in detail (at a minimum) in the forthcoming draft EIS: No-Action (as required by NEPA, the Proposed Action (based on a revised proposal received from Mt. Ashland Association), an alternative to the Proposed Action in the Middle Fork Ashland Creek area that addresses a reduced impact to Englemann spruce and wetlands, an expansion alternative based on development of additional facilities sited in the "Knoll" area, and an alternative that would primarily expand ski area facilities in areas already