

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR****National Park Service****30-Day Notice of Submission to the Office of Management and Budget; Opportunity for Public Comment**

**AGENCY:** Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** Under provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and 5 CFR Part 1320, Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements, the National Park Service (NPS) invites public comments on a proposed new collection of information (OMB #1024-XXXX).

**DATES:** Public comments on this Information Collection Request (ICR) will be accepted on or before September 10, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments directly to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior (OMB #1024-XXXX), Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB, by fax at 202/395-6566, or by electronic mail at [oir\\_docket@omb.eop.gov](mailto:oir_docket@omb.eop.gov). Please also send a copy of your comments to Susan Johnson, Air Resources Division, NPS, 12795 W. Alameda Parkway, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, Colorado 80225; or electronically at [Susan\\_Johnson@nps.gov](mailto:Susan_Johnson@nps.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Susan Johnson, Air Resources Division, NPS, 12795 W. Alameda Parkway, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, Colorado 80225; or via phone at 303/987-6694; or via fax at 303/969-2822; or via e-mail address at [Susan\\_Johnson@nps.gov](mailto:Susan_Johnson@nps.gov). You are entitled to a copy of the entire ICR package free-of-charge.

The NPS published a 60-Day Notice to solicit public comments on this ICR in the **Federal Register** on October 10, 2006 (Vol. 71, No. 195, Pages 59521-59522). The comment period closed on December 11, 2006. The NPS received one comment as a result of the publication of this 60-Day **Federal Register** Notice.

*Comment:* The commenter questioned why the visibility study was necessary. The commenter noted that regulations that protect air quality are already in place, but are not stringent enough or inadequately enforced. The commenter also added that the most important air quality-related issue is human health, particularly the health of children.

*Response:* Regulations to protect and improve air quality are currently in place, and new regulations may be proposed in the future. Periodic

economic information is necessary to determine whether these regulations are efficient. Visibility is a valued component of air quality, but current information is outdated, and lacks the benefit of recent advances in measuring such values. The information proposed in this collection will assist regulators in making better-informed air policy decisions. Human health related issues are outside the purview of this proposed effort, but are well recognized as the predominant economic benefit of improved air quality.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title:* Visibility Valuation in National Parks and Wilderness Areas: Pre-Test and Pilot Test.

*Bureau Form Number(s):* None.

*OMB Number:* To be requested.

*Expiration Date:* To be requested.

*Type of Request:* New Collection.

*Description of Need:* The Clean Air

Act includes provisions designed to maintain and enhance visibility at national parks and wilderness areas (Sections 169A, 169B, and 110(a)(2)(j)). The NPS is directed by its Organic Act to "conserve the scenery \* \* \* unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" (16 U.S.C. 1) and the Clean Air Act charges the NPS with an "affirmative responsibility to protect air quality related values (including visibility)" (42 U.S.C. 7475(d)(2)(B)). Therefore, the NPS believes it is imperative that the value of visibility changes is adequately represented in cost-benefit analyses related to State and Federal efforts that may affect visibility (including the Regional Haze Rule, 40 CFR Part 51). Although several studies were conducted to estimate visibility benefits in the 1970s and 1980s, methodologies for estimating the benefits of improvements in environmental goods have advanced significantly since that time. Furthermore, baseline visibility conditions in national parks and wilderness areas have changed significantly over the last few decades. As a result, updated estimates of benefits are required.

Current evaluation of Federal and state air quality legislation or regulations, as well as regional plans or policies that impact NPS-managed areas, is based on virility valuation information in Chestnut and Rowe, 1990 (e.g., see EPA, 2005). The vintage of this study aside, several limitations have been identified by regulators and stakeholders alike, including its limited sample frame (EPA, 2005; Leggett et al., 2004). Thus, the NPS seeks current visibility valuation information that will permit accurate evaluation of programs

and policies affecting visibility in NPS-managed areas.

The NPS plans to conduct a nationwide stated preference survey to estimate the value of visibility changes in national parks and wilderness areas. Stated-preference surveys use carefully designed questions to elicit respondents' willingness to pay for improvements in environmental quality. A general population stated-preference survey is required in this case, as many U.S. citizens may be willing to pay to improve visibility at national parks and wilderness areas, even if they do not use these areas. Stated-preference surveys are the only methodology available to estimate these non-use values. But to ensure that the nationwide survey is unbiased and readily understood by respondents, and that the likely effect of non-response on benefit estimates is known, the pre-test and pilot test must first be conducted.

The pre-testing will be done through focus groups, which will be used to develop and refine a survey instrument for the pilot study. Twelve focus groups will be conducted, with approximately 10 participants in each group (120 in total). Thus, a sufficient number of responses will be gathered to evaluate the information presentation, reliability, internal consistency, response variability, and other properties of the draft survey. Results will be used to make improvements to the survey instrument. NPS will proceed iteratively, modifying the draft survey instrument after each focus group to ensure that the wording of the questions is clear and unbiased, and effectively address the relevant issues.

The pilot study will be designed to account for the potential impact of mail survey non-response on benefit estimates. The pilot study will involve a split-sample comparison between a mail and in-person survey. Respondents will be asked to complete the survey instrument developed during the pre-testing stage. The results will ultimately be used to adjust the benefit estimates obtained in the nationwide survey for potential non-response bias. The final content of the pilot survey instrument will depend on the pre-testing results. At a minimum, the survey will describe the characteristics of various visibility improvement programs and ask respondents to select a preferred program. The survey will also include socio-demographic questions and questions designed to evaluate the respondents' motivation in selecting a preferred program. Surveys will be conducted with approximately 800 individuals.

For this pilot study, 16 neighborhoods will be selected in two metropolitan areas (Phoenix, AZ and Syracuse, NY). Each neighborhood sample will be split into two groups, with 50 households assigned to a mail survey group and 50 households assigned to an in-person survey group. The in-person survey will be conducted in a manner that minimizes the differences between the two survey modes.

Comments are invited on: (1) The practical utility of the information being gathered; (2) the accuracy of the burden hour estimate; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden to respondents, including use of automated information collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

*Frequency of collection:* Once.

*Description of Respondents:* Residents of Atlanta, GA, Chicago, IL, Sacramento, CA (focus groups) and Phoenix, AZ and Syracuse, NY (response rate pilot study).

*Estimated average number or respondents:* Focus groups: 1,200 in recruitment and 120 in pre-testing activities. Pilot study: 480 mail refusals, 320 in-person refusals, and 800 respondents.

*Estimated average number of responses:* 920 (120 responses for focus groups; 800 responses for pilot study).

*Estimated average time burden per respondent:* 2.5 hours for focus group respondents, 20 minutes for pilot survey respondents.

*Frequency of response:* 1 time per respondent.

*Estimated total annual reporting burden:* 567 hours.

Dated: July 12, 2007.

**Leonard E. Stowe,**

NPS, Information Collection Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 07-3916 Filed 8-9-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-52-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Reclamation

#### Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG)

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Reclamation, Interior

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Adaptive Management Program (AMP) was implemented as a result of the Record of Decision on the Operation of Glen Canyon Dam Final Environmental Impact Statement to comply with consultation requirements of the Grand Canyon Protection Act (Pub. L. 102-575) of 1992. The AMP includes a federal advisory committee (AMWG), a technical work group (TWG), a monitoring and research center, and independent review panels. The AMWG makes recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior concerning Glen Canyon Dam operations and other management actions to protect resources downstream of Glen Canyon Dam consistent with the Grand Canyon Protection Act. The TWG is a subcommittee of the AMWG and provides technical advice and recommendations to the AMWG.

*Dates and Addresses:* The AMWG will conduct the following public meeting:

Flagstaff, Arizona—August 29–30, 2007. The meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m. and conclude at 5:30 p.m. on the first day and begin at 8 a.m. and conclude at 4 p.m. on the second day. The meeting will be held at the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center, 2255 N. Gemini Drive, Building 3 Main Conference Room, Flagstaff, Arizona.

*Agenda:* The purpose of the meeting will be to (1) Review and develop a recommendation to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year 2008 Budget, Workplan, and hydrograph; (2) receive updates on the Monitoring and Research Plan, the Beach/Habitat Building Flow Science Plan, public outreach efforts, Long-Term Experimental Plan Environmental Impact Study, and Humpback Chub Recovery Implementation Plan; (3) review fiscal year 2007 mid-year program expenditures; (4) discuss the Roles Ad Hoc Group Report; and (5) discuss basin hydrology/climate changes, and other administrative and resource issues pertaining to the AMP. To view a copy of the draft agenda, please visit Reclamation's Web site at: <http://www.usbr.gov/uc/rm/amp/amwg/mtgs/07aug29/index.html>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Randall Peterson, Bureau of

Reclamation, telephone (801) 524-3758; facsimile (801) 524-3858; e-mail at [rpeterson@uc.usbr.gov](mailto:rpeterson@uc.usbr.gov).

To allow full consideration of information by the AMWG members, written notice must be provided to Randall Peterson, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Regional Office, 125 South State Street, Room 6107, Salt Lake City, Utah 84138; telephone (801) 524-3758; faxogram (801) 524-3858; e-mail at [rpeterson@uc.usbr.gov](mailto:rpeterson@uc.usbr.gov) at least five (5) days prior to the meeting. Any written comments received will be provided to the AMWG members.

Dated: July 19, 2007.

**Randall V. Peterson,**

Manager, Environmental Resources Division, Upper Colorado Regional Office, Salt Lake City, Utah.

[FR Doc. E7-15699 Filed 8-9-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P

## INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

### United States Section; Notice of Availability of Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Improvements to the USIBWC Rio Grande Flood Control Projects Along the Texas-Mexico Border

**AGENCY:** United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC).

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC) has prepared a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Draft PEIS) for future improvements to three Rio Grande Flood Control Projects (FCP) operated by the USIBWC along the Texas-Mexico Border: the Rectification FCP, the Presidio FCP and Lower Rio Grande FCP. The PEIS, prepared in cooperation with the United States Bureau of Reclamation, United States Fish and Wildlife Service and United States Army Corps of Engineers, analyzes potential impacts of the No Action Alternative and three action alternatives for future FCP improvements under consideration.

Because several measures under consideration are at a conceptual level of development, the USIBWC has taken a broad programmatic look at the