conform with the SIPs to attain and maintain the NAAQS. The EPA's implementing regulations require Federal entities to make a conformity determination for all actions which will impact areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for the NAAQS and which will result in total direct and indirect emissions in excess of de minimis levels. The Federal entities must collect information on the SIP requirements and the pollution sources to make the conformity determination. Depending on the type of action, the Federal entities either collect the information themselves, hire consultants to collect the information or require applicants/sponsors of the Federal action to provide the information.

The type and quantity of information required will depend on the circumstances surrounding the action. First, the entity must make an applicability determination. If the net total direct and indirect emissions do not exceed de minimis levels established in the regulations or if the action meets certain criteria for an exemption, a conformity determination is not required. Actions requiring conformity determinations vary from straightforward, requiring minimal information, to complex, requiring significant amounts of information. The Federal entity must determine the type and quantity of information on a case-by-case basis. State and local air pollution control agencies are usually requested to provide information to the Federal entities making a conformity determination and are provided opportunities to comment on the proposed determinations. The public is also provided an opportunity to comment on the proposed determinations.

The EPA would like to solicit comments to:

(i) Evaluate 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;

(ii) Evaluate 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;

(iii) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) 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, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Burden Statement: The estimated total annual projected burden and cost for respondents of Federal agencies are 175,000 hours and $8,027,000. The estimated total annual projected burden and cost for respondents providing information to the Federal agencies are 5,040 hours and $223,000. The estimated total annual projected burden and cost for the State and local agencies are 13,600 hours and $377,279. The estimated total annual projected burden and cost for EPA is 26,200 hours and $720,934. The total annual burden is estimated to be 219,840 hours and $9,348,213. For the 3 years covered by this ICR, the total burden is estimated to be 659,520 hours and $28,044,639. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Dated: April 2, 2001.

Henry C. Thomas, Jr.,

Acting Director, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards.

[FR Doc. 01–10516 Filed 4–26–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6617–5]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 or www.epa.gov/oeca/ofa Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed April 16, 2001 Through April 20, 2001 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 010127, DRAFT EIS, AFS, ID, Caribou National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, Implementation Revised Forest Plan, Bannock, Bear Lake. Bingham, Bonneville, Caribou, Franklin, Oneida and Power Counties, Cache and Rich Counties, UT, Lincoln County, WY, Comment Period Ends: August 31, 2001, Contact: Ric Rine (208) 557–5766.

EIS No. 010128, DRAFT EIS, FHW, MT, Montana State Primary Route 78 (P–78), Reconstruction, Widening and Realignment, from the junction with State Secondary Route 419 (S–419) which is just South of Abarokee, to the Southern end of the Yellowstone River Bridge which is just south of Columbus, MT, Comment Period Ends: June 11, 2001, Contact: Dale W. Paulson (406) 449–5302.

EIS No. 010129, DRAFT EIS, FHW, WI, County Highway J/Wis 164 (I–94 to County E) Corridor Study, Improvements, City of Pewaukee, Villages of Pewaukee and Sussex Towns of Lisbon, Richfield and Polk, Waukesha and Washington Counties, WI, Comment Period Ends: June 18, 2001, Contact: Richard Madrzak (608) 829–7510.

EIS No. 010130, FINAL EIS, COE, CA, Guadalupe River Flood Control and Adjacent Streams Investigation, Proposed Modifications to the Guadalupe River Project, Downtown San Jose, Santa Clara County, CA, Wait Period Ends: May 29, 2001, Contact: Nina Bicknese (916) 557–7948.

EIS No. 010131, DRAFT EIS, UAF, VA, Initial F–22 Operational Wing Beddown Replacing the Existing F–15C at Langley (AFB) or one of the Four Alternative Locations, VA, Comment Period Ends: June 11, 2001, Contact: Brenda Cook (757) 764–5007.

EIS No. 010132, FINAL EIS, IBR, CA, Coachella Canal Lining Water Project, Revised and Updated Information, Approval of the Transfers and Exchanges of Conserved Coachella Canal Water, Construction, Operation and Funding, Riverside and Imperial Counties, CA, Wait Period Ends: May 29, 2001, Contact: Don Mitchell (760) 398–2651.

EIS No. 010133, DRAFT EIS, AFS, OR, Deep Vegetation Management Project, Implementation, Ochoco National Forest, Paulina Ranger District, Crook and Wheeler Counties, OR, Comment Period Ends: June 11, 2001, Contact: Eugene Skrine (541) 447–6900.

EIS No. 010134, FINAL EIS, COE, CA, Bolsa Chica Project, Construction/Road Construction, Restoration and Flood Control Improvement, Section 10/404 Permits and Land Use Plan, City of Huntington Beach, Orange County, CA, Wait Period Ends: May 29, 2001, Contact: Jack Fancher (760) 431–9440.

EIS No. 010135, DRAFT SUPPLEMENT, FHW, VA, Outer Connector Study—Northwest Quadrant Transportation Improvement, from I–95, US 17 and VA–3, Funding, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Stafford and Spotsylvania Counties, WA, Comment Period Ends: July 02, 2001, Contact: Roberto Foresca-Martinez (804) 775–3320.

Dated: April 24, 2001.

Joseph C. Montgomery,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 01–10554 Filed 4–26–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6617–6]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at (202) 564–7167. An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 14, 2000 (65 FR 20157).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–K65230–CA Rating EC2, Fuels Reduction for Community Protection Phase 1 Project on the Six Rivers National Forest, Proposes to Reduce Fuels High Severity Burned Stands, Lower Trinity Ranger District, Humboldt and Trinity Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns related to purpose and project scope, and the need for additional information on the transportation system in the area. EPA also suggested that the final EIS include additional mitigation measures to address sedimentation and temperature issues in affected streams.

ERP No. D–AFS–L65368–ID Rating EC2, Curfew National Grassland Land and Resource Management Plan, Implementation, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Oneida County, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the range of alternatives, and the need for additional information on impacts to air and water quality, and cumulative impacts. EPA suggests that the final EIS include a modified alternative within the range of alternatives that considers a grazing limit of 1000 acres or less. In addition, the FEIS should explain the significance of the changes in sagebrush canopy cover that would occur under each alternative.

ERP No. D–BLM–J02011–00 Rating EO2, Programmatic EIS—Southern Ute Indian Reservation Oil and Gas Development, Implementation, San Juan Basin, LaPlata, Archuleta, Montezuma Counties, CO and Rio Arriba and San Juan Counties, NM.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections with potential adverse impacts from temporary drilling, construction and well service and maintenance activities on 171 acres of wetlands and to federally threatened and endangered species (TES) including protection to active bald eagle nesting areas. The final EIS should include additional information to calculate cumulative impacts to wetlands and TES.

ERP No. D–FAA–E40785–FL Rating EC2, Fort Lauderdale—Hollywood International Airport, Proposed Expansion of Runway 9R–2FL and other Associated Improvements, Funding, Broward County, FL.

Summary: EPA is concerned about the insufficiency of the NEPA air quality analysis, potential noise impacts of the Proposed Project in EJ and non-EJ residential communities near the airport, the predicted loss of tidal mangrove wetlands, the limiting of the alternatives analysis, as well as the potential safety concerns of the proposed runway bridge.

ERP No. D–MMS–L03010–AK Rating EO2, Liberty Development and Production Plan, Beaufort Sea Oil and Gas Development, Implementation, To Transport and Sell Oil to the U.S. and World Markets, Right-of-Way Application, Offshore Beaufort Sea Marine Environment and Onshore North Slope of Alaska Coastal Plan, AK.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections due to the lack of analysis of the issues and concerns of the Inupiat Eskimos as required by Executive Order (EO) 12898, the potentially significant effects from leaks and spills associated with the use of undersea pipelines in the Beaufort Sea, the technological/logistical difficulties in responding to oil spills in the Beaufort, and the potential use of project components for which there are less environmentally damaging options. EPA recommended that additional information and analysis related to these objections be included in the EIS.

ERP No. D–NPS–E64018–GA Rating LO, Cumberland Island National Seashore General Management Plan, Wilderness Management Plan, Commercial Services Plan, Interpretation Plan, Resource Cultural and Natural Management Plan, Implementation, St. Marys County, GA.

Summary: EPA expressed lack of concerns.

Final EISs

ERP No. FA–NOA–E64016–FL, Florida Keys National Sanctuary Comprehensive Management Plan, New Information Concerning the Establishment of the Tortugas Marine Reserves in Seven Fishery Management Plan Amendments in the Gulf of Mexico.

Summary: EPA had no objections to the proposed plan.

Dated: April 24, 2001.

Joseph C. Montgomery,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 01–10555 Filed 4–26–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6971–5]

Science Advisory Board; Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meeting

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC or the ''Committee''), a chartered Federal advisory committee, will meet in a public teleconference on Monday, May 14, 2001 from 1 to 2 pm Eastern Time. The meeting will be hosted out of Conference Room 6428, US EPA, Ariel Rios Federal Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20004. The meeting is open to the public, however, due to limited space, seating will be on a registration-only basis. Consequently, the public is encouraged to connect via phone to the teleconference. For further information concerning the meeting or how to obtain the phone number, please contact the individual listed below.

Background

The CASAC Technical Subcommittee for Fine Particle Monitoring (the ''Subcommittee'') was established in 1996 to provide advice and comment to EPA (through CASAC) on appropriate methods and network strategies for monitoring fine particles in the context of implementing the revised national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS)