FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa Boynton, (703) 603–9052, Local Governments Reimbursement Project Officer, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (5204–G), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, DC 20460.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Affected entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are Local Governments that apply for reimbursement under this program.

Title: Application for Reimbursement to Local Governments for Emergency Response to Hazardous Substance Releases Under CERCLA section 123, EPA ICR #1424.04, OMB Control #2050–0077 which will expire on March 1, 2001.

Abstract: The Agency requires applicants for reimbursement under this program authorized under section 123 of CERCLA to submit an application that demonstrates consistency with program eligibility requirements. This is necessary to ensure proper use of the Superfund. EPA reviews the information to ensure compliance with all statutory and program requirements. The applicants are local governments who have incurred expenses, above and beyond their budgets, for hazardous substance response. Submission of this information is voluntary and to the applicant's benefit. 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 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 item	Average hours per application
Read Instructions [a]	1
Gather Information [b]	3
Compile Information [c]	3
Complete Application [d]	1
File and Maintain Information [e]	1
Total Estimated Burden Hours Per Application	9
Total Estimated Number of Applications Submitted by All Applicants per Year	× 200
Total Estimated Annual Burden Hours	1800
Total Estimated Cost Burden to Responders [f]	$ 23,300

[a] Time to read or hear instructions. This includes the time which will be needed by applicants to familiarize themselves with the requirements for requesting reimbursement and the instructions for completing the application form.

[b] Time to gather information. This includes the time necessary to collect various reports from files and extract pertinent information and find additional reference materials and information.

[c] Time to compile information. This includes the time necessary to assemble information specific to the response for which reimbursement is being sought. This may include interviewing first responders and ascertaining the number of work-hours involved in the response.

[d] Time to complete application. This includes the time required to enter the pertinent information on the application form in accordance with the line-by-line instructions.

[e] Time to file and maintain information. This includes the time needed for preparing file folders, indexes, and filing.

[f] Estimated hourly rate is $18.50. This estimate takes into consideration that the application may be prepared by a secretary, Fire Chief, County Clerk, Health Professional, or other administrative staff.

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.

Dated: October 2, 2000.

Larry Reed,

Acting Director, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response.

[FR Doc. 00–29506 Filed 11–16–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6612–8]

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.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 14, 2000 (65 FR 20157).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–L39057–OR Rating EC2, Rimrock Ecosystem Restoration Project, To Promote Healthy and Sustainable Watershed Conditions, Implementation, Umatilla National Forest, Heppner Ranger District, Grant, Morrow and Wheeler Counties, OR.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns regarding air quality due to prescribed burning, funding of K–V projects, and roads. EPA requested that the EIS commit to completing restoration projects; describe the smoke management program and provide information on road density.

ERP No. D–AFS–L65365–ID Rating EC2, Swan Flat Timber Sale, Proposal to Cut and Haul Sawtimber, Caribou National Forest, Land Resource Management Plan (LRMP), Montpelier Ranger District, Bear Lake County, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns regarding road obliteration, air quality, harvesting in a roadless area, and beetle infestation. EPA requested clarification and additional information on these issues.

ERP No. D–BLM–K67053–CA Rating EC2, Mesquite Mine Expansion Project, To Expand the Existing Open-Pit, Heap-Leach, and Precious Metal Mine, Federal Mine Plan of Operations Approval, Conditional Use Permits and Reclamation Plan Approval, Imperial County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns based on the project's predicted long-term pit water quality, potential

ecological risk, and impacts to waters of the U.S. EPA recommended additional information in the FEIS regarding pit water quality predictions, mitigation, reclamation and bonding, and inclusion of the waste rock sampling and disposal plan and a demonstration of compliance with the Clean Water Act section 404(b)(1) guidelines.

ERP No. D–FRC–E08020–00 Rating EO2, Gulfstream Natural Gas System Project, Construction and Operation, To Provide Natural Gas Transportation Service, AL, MS and FL.

Summary: EPA is concerned that the Gulfstream proposal would impact forested wetlands and marine hard ''live'' bottoms along the proposed pipeline route. Hard bottoms are essentially ''unmitigatable''. EPA also suggested that only one of the two competing alignments across the Gulf of Mexico (separate EISs) should be potentially certificated by FERC (Gulfstream vs. Buccaneer) or only one larger joint effort with modification and further mitigation.

ERP No. DR–BLM–K65213–NV Rating LO, Black Rock Desert area. Minor issues were raised concerning construction of fee collection stations and monitoring for OHV impacts.

Summary: EPA expressed a lack of objections to BLM's preferred management plan for the Black Rock Desert area. Minor issues were raised concerning construction of fee collection stations and monitoring for OHV impacts.

ERP No. DR–FAA–K51037–CA Rating EC2, Metropolitan Oakland International Airport (MOIA), Airport Development Plan (ADP), Reevaluation of the Forecasts and Planning Assumptions in the ADP, Airport Layout Plan Approval, Funding and COE section 404 and 10 Permits Issuance, Port of Oakland, Alameda County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns on cumulative noise, air quality and wetland impacts; impacts to areas regulated under section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act; and environmental justice impacts. EPA also expressed concern with the narrow range of alternatives and requested that one alternative eliminated from consideration be analyzed in detail.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–AFS–E65052–KY Daniel Boone National Forest, Implementation, Salvage Harvest Due to 1998 Storm Damage Timber, McCreary and Pulaski County, KY.

Summary: EPA remains concerned about degradation of the Rock Creek and Marsh Creek waterways from erosion and siltation associated with road building and forestry activities in these areas. Adherence to Best Management Practices and preventing use of off-highway vehicles in these areas should be vigorously implemented and strictly monitored to ensure that water quality and in-stream habitat are fully protected.

ERP No. F–BIA–K65223–CA Cortina Integrated Solid Waste Management Project, Development and Operation, Approval of Land Lease Cortina Indian Rancheria of Wintin Indians, Colusa County, CA.

Summary: The Final EIS addressed the concerns raised by EPA on the Draft EIS. EPA requested that commitments and mitigation measures in the FEIS be reflected in BIA's Record of Decision. Because the project is on tribal land, EPA noted its continuing regulatory and/or permit role under several federal laws, including the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

ERP No. F–NPS–J61102–00 Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks and John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Memorial Parkway Winter Use Plan, Implementation, Fremont County, ID, Gallatin and Park Counties, MT and Park and Teton Counties, WY.

Summary: EPA's review has concluded that the preferred alternative for this project would adequately remedy the on-going significant impacts to environmental resources and human health in these Parks. The document provides a reasonable range of alternatives and discloses, in detail, the environmental effects of each alternative.

ERP No. F–SFW–K99029–NV Clark County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Issuance of a Permit to Allow Incidental Take-of-79 Species, Clark County, NV.

Summary: No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. FS–COE–K32046–CA Port of Los Angeles Channel Deepening Project, To Improve Navigation and Disposal of Dredge Material for the Inner Harbor Channels, Los Angeles County, CA.

Summary: EPA's review found the Final Supplemental EIS to be generally responsive to concerns EPA raised on the Draft Supplemental EIS. EPA provided comments on toxic air contaminants (hazardous air pollutants) associated with the project and the suitability of dredged materials for aquatic or ocean disposal. EPA asked the Corps to explore the feasibility of reasonable mitigation measures for reducing emissions of air toxics.

Dated: November 14, 2000.

Joseph C. Montgomery,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 00–29528 Filed 11–16–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6612–7]

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 November 6, 2000 through November 9, 2000 pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 000381, Final EIS, BOP, CA, Lassen County Federal Correctional Institution (FCI), Construction and Operation, To House Median-Security Inmates and Federal Prison Camp, Possible Site is Southwest Site, Lassen County, CA, Due: December 18, 2000, Contact: David J. Dorworth (202) 514–6470.

EIS No. 000382, Final EIS, SFW, CA, Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration, To Restore and Maintain the Natural Production of Anadromous Fish, Trinity and Humboldt Counties, CA, Due: December 18, 2000, Contact: George Guillen (707) 822–7201.

EIS No. 000383, Draft EIS, BLM, NM, Sierra and Otero Counties Resource Management Plan Amendment and Federal Fluid Minerals Leasing and Development, Implementation, Sierra and Otero Counties, NM, Due: February 20, 2001, Contact: Tom Philips (505) 525–4377.

EIS No. 000384, Draft Supplement, FHW, CO, Colorado Forest Highway 80, Guanella Pass Road (also known as Park County Road 62, Clear Creek County Road 381 and Forest Development Road 118), Additional Alternative includes Rehabilitation, Light Reconstruction and Full Construction, Funding, Clear Creek and Park Counties, CO, Due: January 16, 2001, Contact: Richard Cushing (303) 716–2138.

EIS No. 000385, Final EIS, COE, NB, Sand Creek Watershed Restoration Project, To Develop Environmental Restoration, City of Wahoo, Saunders County, NB, Due: December 18, 2000, Contact: Kevin Mayberry (402) 221–4020.

EIS No. 000386, Final EIS, COE, CA, Murrieta Creek Flood Control and