(OMB) responses to Agency clearance requests, in compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.). 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sandy Farmer at 260–2740, or email at Farmer.sandy@epa.gov, and please refer to the appropriate EPA Information Collection Request (ICR) Number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Responses to Agency Clearance Requests

OMB Approvals

EPA ICR No. 1698.04; Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements Under EPA's Waste Wise Program; was approved 05/09/2001; OMB No. 2050–0139; expires 05/30/2004.

EPA IČR No. 1442.17; Land Disposal Restrictions; on 40 CFR Part 268; was approved 02/08/2001; OMB No. 2050–0085; expires 02/29/2004.

EPA ICR No. 1961.01; Meat Products Industry Survey; was approved 03/01/2001; OMB No. 2050–0225; expires 02/29/2004.

EPA ICR No. 1198.06; Chemical-Specific Rules, TSCA section 8(a); in 40 CFR part 704, subpart B was approved 04/05/2001; OMB No. 2070–0067; expires 04/30/2004.

EPA ICR No. 1135.07; New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for Magnetic Tape Coating Facilities; 40 CFR part 60, subpart SSS; was approved 02/15/01; OMB No. 2060–0171; expires 02/29/2004.

EPA ICR No. 1630.07; Oil Pollution Act Facility Response Plans—40 CFR part 112.20; was approved 05/02/2001; OMB No. 2050–0135; expires 05/31/

EPA ICR No. 1647.03; Exports from and Imports to the United States under International and Bilateral Waste Agreements; in 40 CFR part 262, subparts E, F, and H was approved 04/23/2001; OMB No. 2050–0143; expires 04/30/2004.

EPA ICR No. 1049.09; Notification of Episodic Releases of Oil and Hazardous Substances (Renewal); in 40 CFR parts 110, 117 & 302 was approved 04/24/2001; OMB No. 2050–0046; expires 04/30/2004.

Short Term Extensions

EPA ICR No. 0586.08; Preliminary Assessment Information Rule (PAIR)— TSCA Section 8(a); in 40 CFR part 712; OMB No. 2070–0054; on 03/30/2001 OMB extended the expiration date through 05/31/01.

EPĂ ICR No. 1812 Public Water System Annual Compliance Report; OMB No. 2020–0020; on 03/20/01 OMB extended the expiration date through 04/30/2001.

EPA ICR No. 1000.06; Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) Used in Electrical Equipment; in 40 CFR part 761.20(a)(1)(iii), (iv), (xi), (xii) and (xv); OMB No. 2070–003; on 03/26/2001 OMB extended the expiration date through 06/30/2001.

EPĀ ICR No. 1012.06; Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) Disposal Permitting Regulation; in 40 CFR parts 761.60, 761.70 and 761.75; OMB No. 2070–0011; on 03/26/2001 OMB extended the expiration date through 06/30/2001.

EPA ICR No. 1425/04; Application for Reimbursement to Local Governments for Emergency 123; in 40 CFR part 310; OMB No. 2050–0077; on 03/26/2001 OMB extended the expiration date through 06/30/2001.

EPĂ ICR No. 1445.04; Continuous Release Reporting Regulations (CRRR); in 40 CFR part 308.8; OMB No. 2050– 0086; on 03/26/2001 OMB extended the expiration date through 09/30/2001.

EPA ICR No. 0916.08; Annual Updates of Emission Data to the Aerometic Information Retrieval System (AIRS); in 40 CFR part 51.321 to 51.333 inclusive; OMB No. 2060–0088; on 04/30/2001 OMB extended the expiration date through 05/31/2001.

Comment Filed

EPA ICR No. 0801.13; Requirements for Generators, Transporters, and Hazardous Waste Management Facilities Under the RCRA Hazardous Waste Manifest; in 40 CFR parts 262, 263, 264, and 265; OMB No. 2050–0039; on 04/23/2001 OMB filed comment and continue.

Withdrawn/Continued

EPA ICR No. 1648.03; Control Technology Determination for Equivalent Emission Limitations by Permit; OMB No. 2060–0266; in 40 CFR 63.1–15, 63.50–56; this ICR was withdrawn from OMB review.

OMB Withdrawals

EPA ICR No. 1984.01; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for Plywood and Composite Wood Products Manufacturing Plants (Proposed rule); on 02/13/2001 this ICR was withdrawn from OMB review.

EPA ICR No. 1958.01; State Clean Air Act Section 507 Program Cooperative Agreement Demonstration Outreach Program Evaluation; on 03/12/2001 this ICR was withdrawn from OMB review.

EPA ICR No. 1941.01; Proposed Information Collection Request for the Evaluation of PrintSTEP; on 03/12/2001 this ICR was withdrawn from OMB review.

Transfer

EPA ICR No. 1487.06; Cooperative Agreements and Superfund Contracts for Superfund Response Actions; OMB No. 2030–0038; was transferred to OMB No. 2050–0179 effective 05/17/01.

Dated: August 2, 2001.

Oscar Morales,

Director, Collections Strategies Division. [FR Doc. 01–20789 Filed 8–16–01; 8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[WII06-01-7336; FRL-7036-5]

Adequacy Status of the Ozone
Attainment Demonstration and Post
1999 Rate of Progress Plan Motor
Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the
Milwaukee Severe Ozone Area, the
Manitowoc Moderate Ozone Area, and
the Sheboygan Ozone Maintenance
Area for Transportation Conformity
Purposes

AGENCY: Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of adequacy.

SUMMARY: In this notice, EPA is notifying the public that EPA has found that the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets (MVEB) in the Wisconsin ozone attainment demonstration and post 1999 Rate of Progress (ROP) plan are adequate for conformity purposes. These MVEBs cover the Milwaukee severe ozone area, the Manitowoc moderate ozone area, and the Sheboygan ozone maintenance area for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) and Oxides of Nitrogen (NO $_X$) for 2002, 2005, and 2007. On March 2, 1999, the D.C. Circuit Court ruled that submitted State Implementation Plans (SIPs) cannot be used for conformity determinations until EPA has affirmatively found them adequate. As a result of our finding, Milwaukee, Manitowoc, and Sheboygan areas can use the MVEBs from the submitted ozone attainment demonstration and the submitted post 1999 ROP plan for future conformity determinations. These budgets are effective September 4, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The finding and the response to comments will be available at EPA's conformity website: http://www.epa.gov/otaq/

transp/, (once there, click on the "Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity").

Michael Leslie, Environmental Engineer, Regulation Development Section (AR–18J), Air Programs Branch, Air and Radiation Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353–6680, leslie.michael@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Today's notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. EPA Region 5 sent a letter to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources on July 25, 2001, stating that the Milwaukee, Manitowoc, and Sheboygan MVEBs in the submitted ozone attainment demonstration and ROP plan for 2002, 2005 and 2007 are adequate. This finding will also be announced on EPA's conformity website: http://www.epa.gov/otaq/ transp/, (once there, click on the "Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity").

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA's conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to state air quality implementation plans and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Transportation conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.

The criteria by which we determine whether a SIP's motor vehicle emission budgets are adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review, and it also should not be used to prejudge EPA's ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find a budget adequate, the EPA may later disapprove the SIP.

We've described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in guidance (May 14, 1999 memo titled "Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision"). We followed the guidance in making our adequacy determination.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: August 6, 2001.

David A. Ullrich,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5. [FR Doc. 01–20788 Filed 8–16–01; 8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6621-1]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared pursuant to the Environmental ReviewProcess (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 May 18, 2001 (66 FR 27164).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-AFS-L65384-OR Rating EC2, Drew Creek, Diamond Rock and Divide Cattle Allotments, Issuance of Term Grazing Permits on Livestock Allotments on Tiller Ranger District, Implementation, Umpqua National Forest, Douglas and Jackson Counties, OR.

Summary

EPA expressed environmental concerns for the Clean Water Act 303(d)-listed streams in the three remaining cattle allotments. EPA requested that the final EIS include costs to administer the proposed new grazing allotments and disclose impacts of grazing fewer cattle on aquatic and terrestrial resources as well as including details of how the Forest Service will meet the Aquatic Conservation Strategy to restore and maintain watersheds and aquatics.

ERP No. D–BPA–L08054–OR Rating LO, Condon Wind Project, Execution of One or More Power Purchase and Transmission Services Agreements to Acquire and Transmit up to the Full Electrical Output, NPDES Permits and Right-of-Way Permit for Public Land, Gilliam County, OR.

Summary

EPA commented that the EIS was well written and complete, and satisfactorily addressed EPA's scoping comments regarding the potential for avian mortality. EPA requested additional clarification regarding cumulative effects and potential impacts to power rates.

ERP No. D-COE-K39066-CA Rating EC2, Port of Long Beach Pier J South Terminal, Redevelopment of two existing Marine Container Terminals into One Terminal, COE Section 404, 401 and 10 Permits, City of Long Beach, CA.

Summary

EPA expressed concerns, and requested additional information regarding: coordination of dredge and fill activities in the Port area, water quality impacts, compliance with Clean Water Act Section 404, and air quality impacts.

ÈRP No. D–GSA–C81032–NY Rating EC2, U.S. Mission to the United Nations (USUN), Demolition of Current USUN and the Construction of a New Facility on the Same Site, Located at 799 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY.

Summary

EPA expressed concerns regarding air quality conformity issues and requested that this issue be resolved in the final EIS

ERP No. D-USA-J13000-CO Rating EC2, Pueblo Chemical Depot,
Destruction of Chemical Munitions and
Design, Construction, Operation and
Closure of a Facility to Destroy the
Mustard Chemical Agent and Munitions

Summary

EPA expressed concerns about the comparative analysis of the four alternatives for destroying chemical weapons at Puebo. More information is also needed on air emissions and hazardous waste generation.

Dated: August 14, 2001.

Joseph C. Montgomery,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 01–20820 Filed 8–16–01; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6620-9]

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 6, 2001 Through August 10, 2001.

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.