

conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15.

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: 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. Total industry burden is estimated to be 29,550 hours per year, at a total labor cost of \$970,500 per year. Labor costs were estimated based on Table 2 of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Employment Cost Trends. After adding overhead costs of 100 percent to the BLS figures, the resulting hourly labor rates for management, technical, and clerical labor are \$69, \$48, and \$32, respectively. There are no capital costs associated with this collection. Burden was calculated based on the following assumptions:

(i) Initial Notification Reports will have been submitted by nearly all regulated entities (approximately 3000) prior to expiration of the existing ICR.

Therefore, the burden calculation is based on 30 notifications per year beginning in 1999.

(ii) Reading the rule to obtain the recordkeeping and reporting instructions would require 2 hours.

(iii) Completion of the Initial Notification Report would involve 1 hour for data gathering and 1 hour for preparation of the initial notification report.

(iv) Notification of change in date code would require 1 hour preparation time.

(v) Annual planning for recordkeeping activities would require 2 hours.

(vi) Implementation of recordkeeping would require 8 hours per month.

Dated: June 9, 1999.

John S. Seitz,

Director, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards.

[FR Doc. 99-15549 Filed 6-17-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6362-6]

Review of Clean Water Act Continuing Planning Process in California

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, is announcing that the Clean Water Act Continuing Planning Process for California is available for public review, and that EPA is reviewing the State's Continuing Planning Process with respect to the listing of impaired waters and establishment of total maximum daily loads.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David W. Smith, Water Division (WTR-2), U.S. EPA, Region 9, 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105, 415-744-2012.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 303(e) of the Clean Water Act requires that each State establish and maintain a continuing planning process (CPP) consistent with the Act. EPA reviews the State's CPP from time to time. Section 303(d) of the Act requires that each State identify waters within its boundaries not meeting water quality standards, and establish total maximum daily loads for such waters. EPA is reviewing that portion of California's CPP related to section 303(d) to determine whether it is consistent with section 303(e) and EPA's implementing

regulations at 40 CFR 130.5. EPA is providing notice that California's CPP is available for public review. By September 22, 1999, EPA will prepare and make available to interested parties upon request for their review and comment EPA's preliminary written summary of its review. Interested persons may request copies of the CPP and EPA's preliminary written summary of its review when available. EPA will consider any comments on the preliminary written summary submitted not later than forty-five (45) days after the summary becomes available. By December 22, 1999, EPA will determine whether that portion of the CPP related to the section 303(d) program is consistent with the Act and its implementing regulations. EPA will also provide to interested persons upon request a final written summary of EPA's review of the CPP that will include any recommendations for improvement.

Dated: June 9, 1999.

Janet Y. Hashimoto,

Acting Director, Water Division.

[FR Doc. 99-15550 Filed 6-17-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6243-7]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564-7167 OR (202) 564-7153.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed June 07, 1999

Through June 11, 1999 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 990190, DRAFT EIS, COE, TN, KY, Reelfoot lake Project, Implementation of Wetland Preservation, Waterfowl Habitat Restoration, Fishery Improvement, Lake and Obion Counties, TN and Fulton County, KY, Due: August 02, 1999, Contact: Richard Hite (901) 544-0706.

EIS No. 990191, DRAFT SUPPLEMENT, AFS, SD, Veteran/Boulder Area Project, Updated Information on Additional Analysis for the Forbes Gulch Portion within the Beaver Park Roadless Area, Implementation, Black Hills National Forest, Spearfish and Nemo Ranger District, Lawrence and Meade Counties, SD, Due: August 02, 1999, Contact: Joy Trowbridge (605) 642-4622.

EIS No. 990192, FINAL EIS, FHW, MO, MO-13 AND MO-7 Highway/Freeway

Improvements, MO-13 from US 24 in Lexington to Truman Reservoir south of Clinton and MO-7 in the immediate area of Clinton, Funding, Lafayette, Johnson and Henry Counties, MO, Due: July 19, 1999, Contact: Don Neumann, (573) 636-7104.

EIS No. 990193, DRAFT EIS, FHW, WA, Cross-Base Highway, To Develop a new arterial Roadway between I-5 and WA-7 (Pacific Avenue), Between McChard Air Force Base and Ft. Lewis, Genetic Analysis of Western Gray Squirrels, Major Investment Study, Pierce County, WA, Due: August 31, 1999, Contact: Jim Leonard (360) 753-9408.

EIS No. 990194, DRAFT EIS, UAF, NV, Nellis Air Force Base, Proposal to Base or Beddown F-22 Aircraft Force Development Evaluation and Weapons School, Clark County, NV, Due: August 02, 1999, Contact: Don Kellogg (703) 652-6552.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 990145, DRAFT EIS, AFS, UT, South Manti Timber Salvage, To address Ecological and Economic Values affected by Spruce Beetle Activity in the South Manti Project, Manti-La National Forest, Ferron-Price and Sanpete Ranger Districts, Sanpete and Sevier Counties, UT, Due: July 21, 1999, Contact: Don Fullmer (435) 637-2817.

Published FR 06-18-99—Review Period extended.

Dated: June 15, 1999.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 99-15562 Filed 6-17-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6243-8]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared May 24, 1999 through May 28, 1999 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 09, 1999 (64 FR 17362).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-USN-K11097-GU Rating LO, Agana Naval Air Station Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Guam.

Summary: EPA expressed a lack of objection to the project.

ERP No. D-USN-K11098-CA Rating EC2, Alameda Naval Air Station and Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Disposal and Reuse, Alameda Annex and Facility, City of Alameda and Alameda County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns, because the Environmental Impact Report and the DEIS were prepared as separate documents with potentially different mitigation proposals, and due to specific concerns with hazardous materials and wastes.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-AFS-J65291-MT Ash and Iron Mountain Grazing Permit Reissuance, Allotment Gallatin National Forest, Park County, MT.

Summary: EPA review did not identify any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes in the proposal, therefore EPA has no objection to the action.

ERP No. F-DOE-K08022-AZ Griffith Energy Project, Construction and Operation, 520-Megawatt (MW) Natural Gas-Fired and Combined Cycle Power Plant, Right-of-Way Grant, Operating Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, Kingman, AZ.

Summary: EPA's previous objections have been resolved, therefore EPA has no objection to the action as proposed.

ERP No. F-FTA-J40143-UT University-Downtown-Airport Transportation Corridor, Major Investment Study, Construction and Operation of the East-West Corridor Light Rail Transit (LRT), Transportation System Management (TSM) and Central Business District (CBD), Funding, Salt Lake County, UT.

Summary: EPA's review has not identified any potential impacts, when combined with proposed mitigation measures, that require substantive changes to implementation of preferred alternative.

ERP No. FB-COE-K36009-CA Napa River and Napa Creek Flood Protection Project, New and Refined Information, City of Napa, Napa County, CA.

Summary: Review of the Final EIS has been completed and the project found to be satisfactory. No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

Dated: June 15, 1999.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 99-15563 Filed 6-17-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6363-7]

Support of Small Watershed Programs; Request for Proposals and Federal Grant Applications FY 99, U.S. EPA, Region III, Chesapeake Bay Program Office

EPA seeks to award financial assistance to support communities undertaking small-scale watershed projects for the benefit of the Chesapeake Bay and its rivers. Congressional appropriation of \$750,000 has been designated for the Small Watershed Grant Program for fiscal year 1999. Funding will be provided to an intermediary organization under the authority of Section 104(b)(3) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) to make subawards to local governments and communities that are eligible to apply and are engaged in watershed protection. Intermediary organizations that are eligible for financial assistance awards include non-profits, interstate agencies, and educational institutions that have experience with federal grant procedures. Subawards administered by the intermediary organization may support investigations, experiments, surveys, studies, training, and demonstrations (as allowed by Section 104(b)(3) of the CWA) to work towards the protection and restoration of the Chesapeake Bay and its rivers.

Electronic versions of the full Request for Proposals (RFP), links to background information and links to federal grant information are provided at the EPA Region III home page at: <http://www.epa.gov/r3chespk/smallwater/>.

All applicants will be required to provide a full federal grant application. A grant application kit and RFPs are available by calling Kim Scalia at 215-814-5421, by E-mail at: Scalia.Kimberly@EPA.GOV or by visiting: <http://www.epa.gov/ogdunix1/grants.htm>

Send signed original and five copies of complete grant application to: Ms. Kim Scalia (3CB00), Chesapeake Bay Program Office, US EPA Region 3, 1650 Arch St., Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029.

All Applications must be Postmarked by July 15, 1999.