

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 12, 2002, (67 FR 11992).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-DOE-L05224-WA Rating LO, Maiden Wind Farm Project, Proposes to Construct and Operate up to 494 megawatts (MW) Wind Generation on Privately- and Publicly-owned Property, Conditional Use Permits, Benton and Yakima Counties, WA.

Summary: EPA has no significant concerns with the project.

ERP No. D-FHW-F40404-MN Rating EO2, Trunk Highway (TH) 53 Project, Transportation Improvements, from 1.2 km (¾ mile) South of St. Louis County Road 307 to the South City Limits of Cook, NPDES Permit, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, St. Louis County, MN.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections regarding the magnitude of wetland impacts, lack of a detailed wetland mitigation plan, impacts to U.S. Forest Service land, and possible forest fragmentation and wildlife habitat issues. EPA requested that additional information on wetland mitigation, forest fragmentation and wildlife habitat impacts be developed and taken into consideration when identifying a preferred alternative.

ERP No. D-FHW-H40403-KS Rating EC2, US 59 Highway Construction Improvements, Lawrence to Ottawa, Funding, NPDES Permit Issuance and Possible US Army COE Permit Issuance, Douglas and Franklin Counties, KS.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the degree of information provided on cultural resources, noise impacts, and endangered species. EPA requested that appropriate mitigation measures be described in more detail for these three project impacts.

ERP No. D-NPS-D65025-WV Rating LO, National Coal Heritage Area, Strategic Management Action Plan, Implementation, Boone, Cabal, Layette, Logan, McDowell, Mercer, Mingo, Raleigh, Summers, Wayne and Wyoming Counties, WV.

Summary: EPA expressed lack of objections to the preferred alternative.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-AFS-F65029-IL Midewin National Tallgrass, Proposed Land and Resource Management Plan,

Implementation, Prairie Plan Development, Will County, IL.

Summary: EPA has no objection to the action as proposed since the final EIS addressed previous concerns regarding water quality, preserving wetland functions, invasive species, and non-target agricultural practice impacts.

ERP No. F-BLM-K67052-NV Newmont Gold Mining, South Operations Area Project Amendment, Operation and Expansion, Plan of Operations, Elko and Eureka Counties, NV.

Summary: EPA expressed continuing objections to the proposed project because the existing mine is currently out of compliance with its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) discharge effluent limitations for total dissolved solids (TDS) and possibly other constituents. EPA recommended that BLM not approve the Plan of Operations for the proposed expansion until the mine comes into compliance with its permit. EPA also expressed concerns regarding the acid generating potential of the waste rock, and recommended that BLM include specific commitments in its Record of Decision (ROD) to ensure the appropriate ratio of acid neutralizing waste rock to acid generating waste rock during disposal. EPA recommended that BLM consider additional monitoring and address any long-term bonding needs prior to issuance of the Plan of Operations.

ERP No. F-MMS-L03010-AK Liberty Development and Production Plan, Beaufort Sea Oil and Gas Development, Implementation, To Transport and Sell Oil to the U.S. and World Markets, Right-of-Way Application, Offshore Beaufort Sea Marine Environment and Onshore North Slope of Alaska Coastal Plan, AK.

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

ERP No. F-USA-D11032-PA Fort Indiantown Gap National Guard Training Center, Training and Operations Enhancement, Pennsylvania National Guard (PANG), Annville, Dauphin and Lebanon Counties, PA.

Summary: EPA has no objection to the proposed action since previous issues were adequately addressed within the Final EIS.

Dated: June 18, 2002.

B. Katherine Biggs,

Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 02-15727 Filed 6-20-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7236-3]

Draft Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by the Environmental Protection Agency

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of comment request extension.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has developed Draft Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by the Environmental Protection Agency (Information Quality Guidelines). EPA is extending the comment period regarding its draft Information Quality Guidelines from May 31, 2002 to June 21, 2002.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 21, 2002, 11:59 pm EST.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to: Docket ID No. OEI-10014 which has been established at: U.S. EPA, Northeast Mall, Room B607, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460. See the "Supplementary Information" section for instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Evangeline Tsibris Cummings, Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Information, Telephone: 202-566-0621; Fax: 202-566-0706; e-mail: cummings.evangelina@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has developed draft Information Quality Guidelines, in response to an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guideline directing all Federal agencies to develop and implement their own guidelines by October 1, 2002 (67 FR 8451, February 22, 2002). The draft Information Quality Guidelines are available at the EPA web site, www.epa.gov/oei/qualityguidelines. Comments may be submitted by web site, e-mail, mail, facsimile, or in person. EPA encourages you to submit your comments electronically to ensure timely receipt. Please visit the EPA web site, www.epa.gov/oei/qualityguidelines, or the previous notice (67 FR 21234-21235, April 30, 2002) for instructions on how to submit your comments.

Dated: June 14, 2002.

Mark Luttner,

*Director, Office of Information Collection,
Office of Environmental Information.*

[FR Doc. 02-15724 Filed 6-20-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Council on Environmental Quality

Proposed Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of information

AGENCY: Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President.

ACTION: Proposed guidelines and corrections to comment request.

SUMMARY: This notice requests comment on proposed guidelines. These proposed guidelines were first published in **Federal Register** Vol. 67 No. 98 on May 21, 2002. They were accompanied by a request for comments, however, the email address listed was incorrect. This notice has the correct email address and an extended comment period to July 15, 2002.

These guidelines implement Section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 106-554; H.R. 5658). Section 515 directs the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to issue government-wide guidelines under sections 3504(d)(1) and 3516 of Title 44, and require each Federal agency to issue agency-specific guidelines, to ensure and maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information, including statistical information, disseminated by the agency and to establish administrative mechanisms allowing affected persons to seek and obtain correction of information maintained and disseminated by the agency that does not comply with such guidelines. Each agency must also report periodically to the OMB director on the number, nature, and resolution of complaints received by the agency in regards to these requirements.

The proposed guidelines published below would implement these requirements for the Council on Environmental Quality. They are intended to comply with both the statutory requirements noted above and the final guidelines published by OMB on February 22, 2002 (Vol. 67 **Federal Register** No. 36, at 8452).

DATES: Public comments must be submitted by July 15, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Please submit comments to Dinah Bear, General Counsel of the Council on Environmental Quality, 722 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, DC 20503. Comments can be emailed to info_quality@ceq.eop.gov

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Dinah Bear, General Counsel, Council on Environmental Quality, 722 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, DC 20503. Telephone: (202) 395-7421.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice of this action appeared in The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) was established by Congress in 1969 through passage of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*, and is an agency within the Executive Office of the President (EOP). The Chairman of CEQ, who is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, serves as the principal environmental policy adviser to the President. CEQ coordinates federal environmental efforts and works closely with agencies and other White House offices in the development of environmental policies and initiatives. CEQ also oversees Federal agencies implementation of NEPA through promulgation of regulations implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508) and through interpretation of statutory requirements. CEQ also has a variety of other responsibilities under NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 and other statutes.

Section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-554, hereinafter referred to as Section 515) directs the Office of Management and Budget to issue government-wide guidelines that "provide policy and procedural guidance to Federal agencies for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information (including statistical information) disseminated by Federal agencies." OMB has required agencies to publish draft guidelines no later than May 1, 2002. The Council on Environmental Quality's guidelines will be published in the **Federal Register** and posted on the agency's web site at www.whitehouse.gov/ceq.

The following are CEQ's "Proposed Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by the Council on Environmental Quality":

A. CEQ will ensure that all information it disseminates to the public meets all applicable standards of quality, including objectivity, utility

and integrity. CEQ hereby adopts this standard of quality, as a performance goal, and adopts the following procedures for the incorporation of information quality criteria into CEQ information dissemination activities.

1. Objectivity and Utility of Information.

As defined in Section C, below, "objectivity" is a measure of whether disseminated information is "accurate, clear, complete, and unbiased;". "Utility" refer to the usefulness of the information to its intended audience. CEQ is committed to disseminating reliable and useful information. Before disseminating information, CEQ staff and officials will ensure that the information has been reviewed in an information quality review process that is proportional to the importance of the information. It is the primary responsibility of the professional staff person drafting information intended for dissemination, or supervising the preparation of such information, to use the most knowledgeable and reliable sources reasonably available to confirm the objectivity and utility of such information.

2. Much of the information CEQ disseminates consists of or is based on information submitted to CEQ by other Federal agencies. Prior to dissemination of such information, responsible CEQ staff will obtain a written statement from the agency submitting the information attesting that the information meets the agency of origin's information quality guidelines.

3. In seeking to assure the "objectivity" and "utility" of the information it disseminates, CEQ will generally follow the basic clearance process established internally by the Chief of Staff and, where appropriate, the government-wide clearance process coordinated by OMB. Where appropriate, substantive input will be sought from within CEQ, other offices within the EOP, other government agencies, non-government organizations, and the public. When CEQ determines that the transparency of information is relevant for assessing the information's usefulness from the perspective of the users of the information, including the public, CEQ shall ensure that transparency has been appropriately addressed and provided. In determining the appropriate level of transparency, CEQ should consider the types of data that can practicably be subjected to a reproducibility requirement given ethical, feasibility, and confidentiality constraints.

4. The CEQ staff member or official responsible for the dissemination of information should generally take the