

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL 6980-2]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; 2001 Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act (EPCRA) and Risk Management Program (RMP) Implementation Status Questionnaire for Tribal Emergency Response Commissions (TERCs) and Their Duly Appointed Local Emergency Planning Committee(s) (LEPCs)**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that the following Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval: 2001 Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) and Risk Management Program (RMP) Implementation Status Questionnaire for Tribal Emergency Response Commissions (TERCs) and Their Duly Appointed Local Emergency Planning Committee(s) (LEPCs), EPA ICR No. 2004.01. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden and cost; where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instrument.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before June 18, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Send comments, referencing EPA ICR No. 2004.01 to the following addresses: Sandy Farmer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Collection Strategies Division (Mail Code 2822), 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, contact Sandy Farmer at EPA by phone at (202) 260-2740, by E-mail at Farmer.sandy@epamail.epa.gov, or download off the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/icr> and refer to EPA ICR No. 2004.01. For technical questions about the ICR contact Sam Agpawa on 415-744-2342.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: 2001 Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA)

and Risk Management Program (RMP) Implementation Status Questionnaire for Tribal Emergency Response Commissions (TERCs) and Their Duly Appointed Local Emergency Planning Committee(s) (LEPCs), EPA ICR No. 2004.01. This is a new collection.

Abstract: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, Superfund Division, proposes to conduct a Regional survey of the Tribal Emergency Response Commissions (TERCs). The information collected in this survey will be used to assess the progress, status, needs, resources and activity level of TERCs. The information will be used by EPA Region IX staff to gain a better understanding of EPA Region IX tribes' actual implementation of EPCRA and RMP. The Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (EPCRA), also known as SARA Title III, and the Risk Management Program (RMP) under the Clean Air Act, 1990, section 112(r) and 40 CFR part 68, June 20, 1996, introduced fundamental changes in the regulation of chemical facilities and the prevention of and preparedness for chemical accidents. These laws and rules seek to improve emergency preparedness and reduce the risk of chemical accidents by providing information to citizens about the chemicals in their community. EPCRA, in conjunction with the RMP requirements, sought to create partnerships between all levels of government, tribal governments, and the regulated tribal community to identify, prevent, plan, prepare and respond to hazardous material risks in our communities, including tribal lands, reservations, rancherias and colonies. The purpose of this survey is to obtain input from the tribal organizations to improve Region IX's EPCRA and RMP programs.

An agency may not 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 **Federal Register** document required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on January 10, 2001 (66 FR 1975); no comments were received.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and record keeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 2 hours per response. 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.

Respondents/Affected Entities: TERCs and Tribal LEPCs.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 145.

Frequency of Response: Once.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 290 Hours.

Estimated Total Annualized Capital, Operating/Maintenance Cost Burden: \$0.

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. 2004.01 in any correspondence.

Dated: May 3, 2001.

Oscar Morales,

Director, Collection Strategies Division.

[FR Doc. 01-12578 Filed 5-17-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6618-1]

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 May 07, 2001 Through May 11, 2001

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 010164, Draft EIS, AFS, MT, Little Bear-Wilson Timber Sale and Road Decommission Project, Implementation, Gallatin Range, Gallatin National Forest, Bozeman Ranger District, Gallatin County, MT, Comment Period Ends: July 02, 2001, Contact: Tim Hancock (406) 522-2554.

EIS No. 010165, Draft EIS, AFS, UT, Flat Canyon Federal Coal Lease Tract

(UTU-77114), Application for Learning, Manti-La Sal National Forest, Ferron-Price Ranges District, Sanpete and Emery Counties, UT, Comment Period Ends: July 02, 2001, Contact: Stan Perks (801) 539-4038. The US Department of Agriculture Forest Service and US Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management are Joint Lead Agencies for this project.

EIS No. 010166, Draft EIS, NPS, VA, Green Spring Colonial National Historical Park Management Plan, Implementation, James City County, VA, Comment Period Ends: July 11, 2001, Contact: Alec Gould (757) 898-3400.

EIS No. 010167, Draft EIS, AFS, UT, WY, Wasatch-Cache National Forest Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Implementation, several counties, UT and Uinta County, WY, Comment Period Ends: September 04, 2001, Contact: Jack Blackwell (801) 524-3908.

EIS No. 010168, Final EIS, AFS, MT, Knox-Brooks Timber Sales and Road Rehabilitation, Implementation, Lola National Forest, Super Ranger District, Mineral County, MT, Wait Period Ends: June 18, 2001, Contact: Bruce Erickson (406) 822-3957.

EIS No. 010169, Draft EIS, FTA, NC, Phase I Regional Rail System Improvements, Durham to Raleigh to North Raleigh, Implementation, Durham and Wake Counties, NC, Comment Period Ends: July 20, 2001, Contact: Alex McNeil (404) 562-3511.

EIS No. 010170, Final EIS, FHW, CA, San Francisco—Oakland Bay Bridge, East Span Seismic Safety Project, Connection between I-80 Yerba Buena Island and Oakland, US Coast Guard Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, San Francisco and Alameda Counties, CA, Wait Period Ends: June 18, 2001, Contact: C. Glenn Clinton (916) 498-5020.

EIS No. 010171, Draft EIS, FTA, CA, San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor Project, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on former Burbank/ Chandler Southern Pacific Rail Right-of-Way, Development and Implementation, Los Angeles County, CA, Comment Period Ends: July 03, 2001, Contact: Ervin Poka (213) 202-3950.

EIS No. 010172, Draft EIS, FHW, MD, MD-210 (Indian Head Highway) Multi-Modal Study, MD-210 Improvements between I-95/I-495 (Capitol Beltway) and MD-228 Funding and US COE Section 404 Permit Issuance, Prince George's County, MD, Comment Period Ends: September 23, 2001, Contact: Nelson Castellanos (410) 962-4342.

EIS No. 010173, Draft EIS, USN, CA, Point Molate Property Naval Fuel Depot (NFD) for the Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, City of Richmond, Contra Costa County, CA, Comment Period Ends: July 02, 2001, Contact: Roberta Montana (619) 532-0942.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 010088, Draft EIS, FHW, NB, Lincoln South and East Beltways Project, To Complete a Circumferential Transportation System linking I-80 on the north and U.S.77 on the west, Funding, COE 404 Permit, Lancaster County, NB, Comment Period Ends: June 15, 2001, Contact: Edward Kosola (402) 437-5973. Revision of FR Notice Published on 03/23/2001: CEQ Review Period Ending 05/07/2001 has been Extended to 06/15/2001.

EIS No. 010159, Draft Supplement, DOE, NV, Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste, Construction, Operation, Monitoring and Eventually Closing a Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Updated and Additional Information, Nye County, NV, Comment Period Ends: June 25, 2001, Contact: Jane R. Summerson (702) 794-1493. Revision of FR notice published on 05/11/2001: Correction to Title.

Dated: May 15, 2001.

Joseph C. Montgomery,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 01-12570 Filed 5-17-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6618-2]

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.

Summary of Rating Definitions Environmental Impact of the Action Lo—Lack of Objections

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts

requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC—Environmental Concerns

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EO—Environmental Objections

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU—Environmentally Unsatisfactory

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1—Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2—Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information,