

includes the linear feet of perennial or intermittent stream bed that is filled or excavated. This statement is inaccurate because ephemeral stream bed that is filled or excavated can also be considered a loss of waters of the United States. However, the 300 linear foot limit for stream beds filled or excavated does not apply to ephemeral streams. We have modified this sentence to define the loss of stream bed as the linear feet of stream bed that is filled or excavated." Thus, the modification of this definition was intended to clarify that activities that involve filling or excavating ephemeral streams are not included in the linear foot limits for filling or excavating stream beds in NWP's 39, 40, 42, and 43. However, it was not intended to exempt ephemeral waters or streams from calculations of impacted acreages to determine PCN or maximum acreage requirements in accordance with NWP's 39, 40, 42, and 43.

In the August 9, 2001, **Federal Register** notice (66 FR 42099) we proposed to modify the definition of "Loss of Waters of the US" by adding the sentence "* * * The loss of stream bed includes the linear feet of perennial stream or intermittent stream that is filled or excavated * * *". The proposed change was in response to a commitment to clearly state in the text of the NWP's (which includes the definitions) that the 300 linear foot limit in NWP's 39, 40, 42, and 43 for filling and excavating stream beds would only apply to intermittent and perennial streams, not to ephemeral streams.

In the January 15, 2002, **Federal Register** notice (67 FR 2074-2075) we erroneously stated that both the acreage and linear limits of the NWP's do not apply to ephemeral waters. This was never intended to be adopted as policy for the NWP's or the Corps regulatory program. As previously stated, in the first column of page 2075 of the January 15, 2002, **Federal Register** notice, we refer to page 12881 of the March 9, 2000, **Federal Register** notice, which only discusses the 300 linear foot limit, not the acreage limits of the NWP's. Our intent is to continue to apply acreage limits of NWP's to activities that result in the permanent loss of ephemeral waters, but the linear foot limits of the NWP's (*i.e.*, NWP's 39, 40, 42, and 43) for filling or excavating stream beds would not apply to activities that involve filling or excavating ephemeral streams. The last sentence of the definition of "Loss of Waters of the US" as published in the January 15, 2002, **Federal Register** notice does not comport with remainder of this NWP package.

Therefore, we are correcting this definition as described above.

We believe that correcting the text of NWP 39 and the definition of "Loss of Waters of the US" through the publication of this correction notice is appropriate. Nevertheless, in order to give all interested parties further opportunity to comment on this matter, we intend to publish a **Federal Register** notice to solicit public comments on those two corrections. If we determine that any other matter relating to the final NWP's requires correction or clarification, but that matter was not adequately dealt with in this correction notice, we will address that additional matter in the forthcoming **Federal Register** notice, as well. We expect to publish that **Federal Register** notice within a few weeks.

Dated: February 7, 2002.

Lawrence A. Lang,

*Assistant Chief, Operations Division,
Directorate of Civil Works.*

[FR Doc. 02-3555 Filed 2-12-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-92-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:

Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

TIME AND DATE: 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., February 5, 2002.

PLACE: Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Board of Regents Conference Room (D3001), 4301 Jones Bridge Road, Bethesda, MD 20814-4799.

STATUS: Open—under "Government in the Sunshine Act" (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)).

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

8:30 a.m. Meeting—Board of Regents

- (1) Approval of Minutes—November 14, 2001
- (2) Faculty Matters
- (3) Department Reports
- (4) Financial Report
- (5) Report—President, USUHS
- (6) Report—Dean, School of Medicine
- (7) Report—Dean, Graduate School of Nursing
- (8) Comments—Chairman, Board of Regents
- (9) New Business

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Mr. Bobby D. Anderson, Executive Secretary, Board of Regents, (301) 295-3116.

Dated: February 8, 2002.

Linda Bynum,

*OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer,
Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 02-3683 Filed 2-11-02; 3:32 pm]

BILLING CODE 5001-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of Education.

SUMMARY: The Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before March 15, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Lauren Wittenberg, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503 or should be electronically mailed to the internet address Lauren_Wittenberg@omb.eop.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment.