routes. These are detailed in Table S–1 in both the Draft and Final EIS. Briefly, the alternative selected as the environmentally preferred alternative, although slightly longer, impacts less agricultural land and has less potential to adversely affect local transportation. Transmission line routing options were all developed to try to utilize existing rights-of-way (canals, roads, pipelines, and transmission lines) and field lines to minimize establishing new rights-of-way that were not necessary and/or avoid needlessly traversing the middle of properties. The Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 and 2 were developed to take advantage of those various routing opportunities between the Project site and the Coolidge Substation. Alternative 3 was developed in direct response to comments from local landowners and the Arizona power plant and transmission line siting committee in order to mitigate concerns they had about the effects that the other transmission line alternatives would have on their continued use of their property. Alternative 3 was selected.

Mitigation Measures

All measures addressed in the EIS to minimize adverse impacts from the transmission system additions have been adopted. Table 2–4 in the Draft EIS lists the standard mitigative measures that are part of Western's proposed action. These would be used for the transmission line additions. Some of the measures include restricting vehicular traffic to existing access roads or public roads, recontouring and reseeding disturbed areas, environmental awareness training for all construction and supervisory personnel, and mitigation of radio and television interference generated by transmission lines. Additionally, Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) plans for modified facilities will be reviewed to ensure new equipment is addressed.

In addition, Western will ensure that PPL Sundance Energy, LLC, implements the following measures:

1. Detailed emergency response plan and SPCC plans that meet Federal, State, and local requirements.
2. Implement conditions of individual or nationwide 404 permits if needed for new pipeline construction across waters of the United States.
3. Conduct pre-construction surveys along the new pipeline route to ensure impacts to special status species do not occur.

A Mitigation Action Plan with annual reporting requirements will be developed for the project to comply with DOE regulations found at 10 CFR part 1021.33 and made available to the public.

Western is the lead Federal agency for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for all components of the project. All archaeological and traditional cultural properties determined significant in consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer and interested tribes will be avoided. If they are somehow not avoided, a mitigation plan will be developed in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer and the interested tribes. Cultural resource monitoring, if needed, will take place during construction of new high voltage transmission lines and pipelines.

Western is also the lead for compliance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. A biological assessment was prepared and submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) with a determination that the project could affect but not adversely affect any candidate, proposed, or listed species. This Record of Decision is being issued based on verbal concurrence from the Service on Western's determination and written concurrence is expected soon. Additionally, during informal consultation, the Service requested, and Western has agreed, if the 14-mile long pipeline is built, the crossing of the Santa Cruz Wash would be enhanced for the cactus ferruginous pygmy owl. The enhancement will include planting mesquite trees on either side of the pipelines to facilitate emigration of the owl.

Floodplain and Wetlands Statement of Findings

Construction of the Sundance Energy Project would not alter the natural drainage patterns on site. The immediately surrounding area is primarily agricultural and contains irrigation canals, which will move water around and away from the facility. No floodplain classifications for the site and surrounding area have been mapped. The storm water flows will be retained on site in constructed basins to minimize sheet flows.

The new gas pipeline would cross portions of the 100-year flood zone of the Santa Cruz Wash but is not anticipated to affect the floodplain. The ground surface would remain relatively unchanged from pre-development conditions.

All transmission system alternatives, including the selected transmission line alternative and the upgrade of the Coolidge-Signal line, would traverse the 100-year flood zone of McClellan Wash near Coolidge. A large portion of the floodplain is spanned by the existing transmission facility. It would not be practical to use existing transmission line structures and rights-of-way without going through the floodplain. No new transmission structures are expected to be placed in the floodplain. Instead, work would be confined to existing structures, resulting in short-term, temporary disturbances to the floodplain. If, after final project design, additional new structures are needed in the floodplain, they will be designed to conform to applicable Federal, State, and local floodplain protection standards.

A portion of the facility gets inundated during heavy rain events. A wetland delineation study was performed on the site and found none of the criteria needed to identify a wetland (i.e., soils, hydrology, and vegetation) existed. No wetlands would be affected by the proposed action.

Dated: August 20, 2001.

Michael S. Hacskaylo,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 01–22008 Filed 8–30–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7047–1]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Assessment of EPA Compliance Assistance Projects

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that EPA is planning to submit the following proposed Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (MB) for renewal: Assessment of EPA Compliance Assistance Projects 1860.01. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection, the expected burden and cost to collect the information, and the actual collection instruments. Before submitting the ICR to OMB for review and approval, EPA is soliciting comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection as described below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before October 1, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Send comments, referencing EPA ICR No. 1860.01 to the following

addresses: Lynn Vendinello, EPA MC 2222A, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460; and to Office of information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For a copy of the ICR or technical questions contact Ms. Lynn Vendinello at EPA by phone at (202) 564–7066, by facsimile (202) 564–0031, or by email at *vendinello.lynn@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Affected Entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are businesses and other members of the regulated community, technical assistance providers that receive or access EPA compliance assistance tools, regulating agencies, and state/local committees that are recipients of required compliance reports. Technical assistance providers are comprised of such groups as: state pollution prevention programs, state small business assistance programs, small business development centers. The request for information from these affected entities will be voluntary.

Title: Information Collection Request for Assessment of EPA Compliance Assistance Projects, EPA ICR Number 1860.01.

Abstract: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is seeking reapproval for a three year generic clearance from Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to determine how well EPA compliance assistance tools and services meet customers needs and to determine the relevant outcomes. This will be a voluntary collection of information to gauge customer satisfaction with the compliance assistance projects, and measure any resulting changes in awareness and understanding, and in limited cases behavioral change and environmental and human health impacts. EPA proposes to use assessment surveys to provide the Agency with feedback on the compliance assistance documents, onsite visits, telephone assistance, Web sites, and compliance assistance seminars and workshops delivered by Headquarters and Regional compliance assistance programs to the regulated community This feedback will provide EPA with the necessary information for improving the quality and delivery of compliance assistance tools and services.

This ICR will only provide anecdotal data for the purpose of informing EPA of the outcomes of compliance assistance tools, and customer satisfaction with those tools. All assessments undertaken under this ICR will adhere to certain conditions to ensure that data is collected and used appropriately. The information collection is voluntary, and will be limited to non-sensitive data concerning the quality of compliance assistance activities. The data resulting from this ICR's assessment activities will not be treated as statistical and will not be used to make broad generalizations to the overall population. The Office of Compliance (OC) attempts to perform such evaluations will be undertaken under a separate ICR so that the public is allowed adequate public comment period on our proposed methodology. This process does not involve fact-finding for the purposes of regulatory development or enforcement.

By seeking a generic clearance of assistance assessments, EPA will have the flexibility it requires to expeditiously gather the views of EPA customers to determine how well the bulk of EPA compliance assistance tools and services meet customers needs and how to improve them. In FY 2000 alone, EPA conducted over 1300 workshops and trainings, over 2700 on-site visits and developed 140 compliance assistance tools. The generic clearance will facilitate the coordinated review and approval of surveys that solicit opinions from EPA customers on a voluntary basis. Every effort will be made to improve response rates to assessment surveys, and maximize the efficiency of data collection.

To ensure the proper use of the data from the surveys, OC will place the following conditions on the way the ICR is used:

- After compliance assistance is delivered, EPA will follow up on the quality of the assistance and the associated outcomes. During the compliance assistance activity, EPA should communicate how it intends to follow-up (*e.g.,* phone, letter, email) and when.
- True behavioral changes will only be considered when they can be directly measured through on-site revisits, self-certifications or other direct observations. Behavioral changes expressed through surveys, training evaluations, and Internet questionnaires will be considered as indications of behavioral change.
- No use of comment cards as they often have low response rates.
- To ensure high response rates, all follow-up mail/email surveys must use the Dillman Tailored Design Method. Staff using phone surveys can also send out a postcard letting attendees know that EPA will be calling.

Compliance assistance activity	Allowed survey method (in order of preference)	Measure
Phone Calls/Hotlines	As part of assistance call	Awareness, Understanding, Customer satisfaction.
	Follow-up call	Awareness and understanding.
	Mail/email follow-up survey	Customer satisfaction.
Workshops/Trainings	Pre/post test	Awareness, Understanding.
	On-Site Post Workshop/Training Evaluation	Awareness, Understanding, Customer satisfaction.
	Phone survey (if fewer than 50 participants).	
	Mail/email follow up (if more than 50 participants).	
Web Sites	Online survey (with promotion of the survey via email).	Awareness, Understanding, Customer satisfaction.
Tools (e.g., manuals)	Mail/email survey	Awareness Understanding, Customer satisfaction.
Onsite visits	Onsite revisits	Awareness, Understanding, Behavioral change, Environmental and human health improvements, Customer satisfaction.
	Phone survey.	
	Mail/email survey.	

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: Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, 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.

It is estimated that approximately 24,823 entities may voluntarily complete and return a compliance assistance activity or tool assessment survey on an annual basis. EPA estimates that participating entities may need to spend between five to twenty minutes to complete either the compliance assistance product, seminar/workshop; onsite visit; telephone assistance/hotline; or Internet web site assessment survey. EPA estimates 3,564 hours annually or 8.64 minutes per respondent may be spent to provide EPA with the data. This burden hour estimate translates to a cost of $9.89 per facility that voluntarily completes the survey and a total cost to the regulated community of $733,861 over the three years covered by the ICR. The costs were calculated based on $32.68 per hour employment expense rate, plus a $110 overhead for a total labor cost of $68.63 (based on labor rates obtained form the United States of Commerce, Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 2001, Employer Costs for Employment Compensation, Table 10: White Collar, Professional and Technical).

Respondents/Affected Entities: 74,470.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 74,470.

Frequency of Response: one time.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 3,564 hours.

Estimated Total Annualized Capital, O&M Cost Burden: $244,620.

Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including through the use of automated collection techniques to the addresses listed above. Please refer to EPA ICR No. 1860.01 in any correspondence.

Dated: August 23, 2001.

Michael M. Stahl,

Director, Office of Compliance.

[FR Doc. 01–22019 Filed 8–30–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6621–4]

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 August 20, 2001 Through August 24, 2001.

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 010321, Draft EIS, FHW, MD, MD–97 Brookeville Project Improvements and Preservation, South of Gold Mine Road to North of Holliday Drive, Funding and US Army Corps of Engineers Section 10 and 404 Permits Issuance, Montgomery County, MD, Due: October 22, 2001, Contact: Francine Shaw-Whitson (410) 962–4342.

EIS No. 010323, Draft Supplement, NOA, AK, Steller Sea Lion Protection Measures in the Alaska Groundfish Fisheries, Fishery Management Plans for Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska and the Groundfish Fishery of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area, AK, Due: October 15, 2001, Contact: James W. Balsiger (907) 586–7221.

EIS No. 010324, Draft EIS, FHW, TN, KY, Corridor 18/Interstate 69 Proposed Improvements from the U.S. 412/U.S. 51 Interchange to the U.S. 51 Fulton Bypass/Purchase Parkway Interchange, Dyer and Obion Counties, TN and Fulton County, KY, Due: October 15, 2001, Contact: Charles Boyd (615) 781–5770.

EIS No. 010325, Final EIS, FHW, NM, Paseo del Volcon Corridor, Acquisition of Right-of-Way and Construction of Roadway, from the Intersection of I–40 to Intersection of NM–44 near the Town of Bernalillo, Bernalillo and Sandoval Counties, NM, Due: October 01, 2001, Contact: Gregory D. Rawlings (505) 820–2027.

EIS No. 010326, Draft EIS, APH, PROGRAMMATIC–EIS Rangeland Grasshopper and Mormon Cricket Suppression Program, Authorization, Funding and Implementation in 17 Western States, AZ, CA, CO. ID, KS, MT, NB, NV, NM, ND, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA and WY, Due: October 15, 2001, Contact: Charles L. Brown (301) 734–8247. This document is available on the Internet at: http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ppd/es/ppqdocs.html.

EIS No. 010327, Draft EIS, FHW, NB, Antelope Valley Study Improvements in three major issues: Stormwater Management, Transportation, Community Revitalization, City of Lincoln, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and the Lower Platter South Natural Resources District, Major Investment Study, Lancaster County, NE, Due: October 15, 2001, Contact: Edward Kosola (402) 437–5973.

EIS No. 010328, Final EIS, TVA, TN, Addition of Electric Generation Baseload Capacity, Proposes to Construct a Natural Gas Fired Combined Cycle Power Plant, Franklin County, TN, Due: October 01, 2001, Contact: Bruce Yeager (865) 632–8051.

EIS No. 010329, Final EIS, AFS, ID, Middle Fork Weiser River Watershed Project, Implementation of Vegetation Restoration, Landscape Fire Pattern and Watershed Restoration Objectives, Payette National Forest, Council Ranger District, Adams County, ID, Due: October 01, 2001, Contact: Faye Krueger (208) 253–0100.

This document is available on the Internet at: www.fs.fed.us/r4/payette/main.html

Dated: August 28, 2001.

B. Katherine Biggs,

Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 01–22063 Filed 8–30–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P