be filed electronically via the Internet in lieu of paper. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. See 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site (*http://www.ferc.gov*) under the ''e-Filing'' link.

k. This application has been accepted, and is ready for environmental analysis at this time.

l. The project includes two developments with a total authorized capacity of 1,755 megawatts (MW) as follows: (a) The Wanapum development consisting of a dam 186.5 feet high and 8,637 feet long with upstream fish passage facilities, a reservoir with an approximate surface area of 14,680 acres, a powerhouse with ten turbine-generator units with a total nameplate capacity of 900 MW, transmission lines, and appurtenant facilities; and (b) the Priest Rapids development consisting of a dam 179.5 feet high and 10,103 feet long with upstream fish passage facilities, a reservoir with an approximate surface area of 7,725 acres, a powerhouse with ten turbine-generator units with a total nameplate capacity of 855 MW, transmission lines, and appurtenant facilities.

m. A copy of the application is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the ''eLibrary'' link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll-free at 1–866–208–3676, or for TTY, (202) 502–8659. A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction at the address in item h above.

All filings must (1) bear in all capital letters the title ''COMMENTS'', ''REPLY COMMENTS'', ''RECOMMENDATIONS,'' ''TERMS AND CONDITIONS,'' or ''PRESCRIPTIONS;'' (2) set forth in the heading the name of the applicant and the project number of the application to which the filing responds; (3) furnish the name, address, and telephone number of the person submitting the filing; and (4) otherwise comply with the requirements of 18 CFR 385.2001 through 385.2005. All comments, recommendations, terms and conditions or prescriptions must set forth their evidentiary basis and otherwise comply with the requirements of 18 CFR 4.34(b). Agencies may obtain copies of the application directly from the applicant. Each filing must be accompanied by proof of service on all persons listed on the service list prepared by the Commission in this proceeding, in accordance with 18 CFR 4.34(b), and 385.2010.

You may also register online at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/esubscription.asp* to be notified via email of new filings and issuances related to this or other pending projects. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support.

n. Procedural Schedule: The application will be processed according to the following schedule for remaining process milestones. Revisions to the schedule may be made as appropriate.

Milestone	Date
Mandatory Terms & Conditions & Recommendations due	60 days from date of this notice.
Issue Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Biological Assessment; Initiate Endangered Species Act Consultation (ESA).	October 2005.
Action due on 401 Water Quality Certificate (one year after application submittal)	October 11, 2005.
Comments due on DEIS (45 days after issuance)	November 2005.
ESA Completed; Biological Opinion due (135 days from initiation)	February 2006.
Issue Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)	April 2006.
Ready for Commission Action	July 2006.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E5–1512 Filed 4–4–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7895–5]

Clean Water Act Section 303(d): Final Agency Action on 2 Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: This notice announces final agency action on 2 TMDLs prepared by EPA Region 6 for waters listed in Louisiana's Barataria river basin, under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Documents from the administrative record file for the 2 TMDLs, including TMDL calculations and responses to comments, may be viewed at *http://www.epa.gov/region6/water/tmdl.htm.* The administrative record file may be examined by calling or writing Ms. Diane Smith at the following address. Please contact Ms. Smith to schedule an inspection.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane Smith, Environmental Protection Specialist, Water Quality Protection Division, U.S. EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, TX 75202–2733, (214) 665–2145.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In 1996, two Louisiana environmental groups, the Sierra Club and Louisiana Environmental Action Network (plaintiffs), filed a lawsuit in Federal Court against the EPA, styled *Sierra Club, et al.* v. *Clifford et al.*, No. 96–0527, (E.D. La.). Among other claims, plaintiffs alleged that EPA failed to establish Louisiana TMDLs in a timely manner.

EPA Takes Final Agency Action on 2 TMDLs

By this notice EPA is taking final agency action on the following 2 TMDLs for waters located within the Barataria river basin:

Subsegment	Waterbody name	Pollutant
020401	Bayou Lafourche—Donaldville to Intracoastal Waterway at Larose	Dissolved Oxygen Nutrients.
020401	Bayou Lafourche—Donaldville to Intracoastal Waterway at Larose	Do.

EPA requested the public to provide EPA with any significant data or information that might impact the 2 TMDLs in the **Federal Register** Notice 69 FR pages 5985–5986 (February 9, 2004). The comments received and the EPA's response to comments may be found at *http://www.epa.gov/region6/water/tmdl.htm.*

Dated: March 29, 2005.

Miguel I. Flores,

Director, Water Quality Protection Division, EPA Region 6.

[FR Doc. 05–6707 Filed 4–4–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[60Day–05–0617)

Proposed Data Collections Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations

In compliance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) will publish periodic summaries of proposed projects. To request more information on the proposed projects or to obtain a copy of the data collection plans and instruments, call 404–371–5983 or send comments to Seleda Perryman, CDC Assistant Reports Clearance Officer, 1600 Clifton Road, MS–D74, Atlanta, GA 30333 or send an email to *omb@cdc.gov.*

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 shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Proposed Project

Willingness to Pay—Extension—Prevention Effectiveness Unit, Office of Workforce and Career Development, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The mission of the Prevention Effectiveness Unit is to provide information and training to build internal and external capacity in economic and decision sciences.

The project is currently underway as a pilot study. Upon completion of the pilot the project will be assessed to determine if the full survey will be completed.

This project will use qualitative and quantitative research to (a) develop and test informational approaches, (educational materials or product labeling), (b) educate consumers about food safety issues, (c) develop and test survey instruments; and (d) test experimental protocols to be used in the main quantitative data collection. The project will also provide a nationally-representative estimate of consumer willingness to pay for (a) publicly-provided reductions in the probability of contracting food-borne illnesses; (b) reductions in severity of symptoms associated with food-borne illnesses, and (c) materials that facilitate private, defensive precautions against food-borne illness during home food preparation (*e.g.*, meat thermometers, antibacterial soaps and cutting boards). Furthermore, the project will estimate the effect of education programs and product labeling on consumer willingness to pay for the reductions; also to compare the empirical estimates of the above mentioned consumer willingness to pay derived from a conjoint analysis instrument and a simulated marketplace experiment.

Public awareness and stated concern regarding food-borne illnesses have increased rapidly over the past decade. The general public, while seemingly well-informed and concerned about some relevant food safety issues, appear unknowledgeable or ill-informed about emerging issues. The *Food Safety Survey* data suggest that information provided to consumers at the point of purchase may be a helpful means of educating the public about food safety. Analyses of consumer purchase data indicate that health-related information provided at the point of purchase can make significant long-term changes in purchasing behavior.

While providing health-related information about food has been the focus of major policy initiatives in the last few years, little empirical economic research has attempted to understand the market and welfare effects of different health information policies. In addition, previous research does not address the distribution of effects across different consumers. Policy makers and food manufacturers cannot provide labels that satisfy everyone's information desires while simultaneously catering to consumers' cognitive and time constraints. As a result, policy makers need to understand how different sectors of the consumer population will be affected, particularly those members of the population who face relatively high food safety risks.

The lack of information hinders policy makers from making informed decisions on the proper allocation of resources in this area since the benefits of reducing the risk of illness are not well known. Not having the information readily available makes cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analyses difficult to do as well as resource-intensive. This data collection effort will reduce this burden by making data available to researchers for use in program and policy evaluation. If this data collection effort did not take place, agencies would either have to continue to piece together data when conducting economic analyses of food safety policies and regulations, or they would need to fund a large scale effort like the one being proposed. Another large scale effort would be a waste of public funds. Informing consumers about the risks and protective measures allows consumers to more accurately assess how much they would pay for reductions in this risk. More importantly, this project will inform the consumer as to what the risks are and how they can protect themselves. This is important since the consumer is the last line of defense in the campaign against food-borne illnesses.