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: EPA estimates that the average annual burden for this ICR is 1,091,445 hours for CAFO respondents (i.e., facilities that may be required to apply for and obtain an NPDES permit), 92,400 hours for States authorized to implement the NPDES permitting program for CAFOs, and 447 hours for Federal agencies. The estimated total number of CAFO respondents over the reporting period is 9,145. This ICR covers a three-year period and the number of respondents per year is phased in at approximately 20 percent in the first year, 40 percent in the second year, and 40 percent in the third year, yielding an annual average number of CAFO respondents of 5,487. Based on this annual average, EPA estimates that there will be 10,974 responses per year, some of which represent one-time responses while others occur annually after CNMP development has been completed. EPA estimates that the average burden per response will be 99 hours, although the burden to develop CNMPs will be larger than the burden for reporting activities. Average total annual O&M costs for manure and soil samples is $665,373 for all respondents; there are no capital costs associated with this ICR. Table 1 summarizes these and other details of the ICR burden and cost estimates.

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF BURDEN AND COSTS FOR THE GUIDANCE MANUAL AND EXAMPLE NPDES PERMIT FOR CONCENTRATED ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATIONS INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUEST

Category	Burden or cost
CAFO Burden by Response:	
—One-time CNMP Development Burden (hours) (A)	1,025,072
—One-time CNMP Development Notification Burden (hours) (B)	3,048
—Annual CNMP Certification Burden (hours) (C)	2,439
—Annual Record Keeping Burden (hours) (D)	60,887
Total Annual CAFO Response Burden (hours) (A+B+C+D)	1,091,445
Annual Manure/soil Sample Cost ($)	$665,373
Annual Number of Responses (E)	10,974
Average Burden per Response (hours) (A+B+C+D)/(E)	99
Annual State Burden (hours)	92,400
Annual Federal Burden (hours)	447

Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, 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: November 15, 1999.

Alfred Lindsey,

Deputy Director, Office of Wastewater Management.

[FR Doc. 99–30234 Filed 11–18–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6248–2]

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 08, 1999 through November 12, 1999 pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 990423, Final EIS, NPS, NB, Homestead National Monument of America, General Management Plan, Implementation, Gage County, NB, Due: December 20, 1999, Contact: Michael Madell (608) 264–5257.

EIS No. 990424, Draft EIS, FHW, FL, FL–423 (John Young Parking), Improvements from FL–50 to Fl–434, City of Orlando, Orange County, FL, Due: January 04, 2000, Contact: Mark Bartlett (850) 942–9650.

EIS No. 990425, Draft EIS, SFW, AK, Wolf Lake Area Natural Gas Pipeline Project, Construction, Approval Right-of-Way Grant and COE Section 404 Permit, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, AK, Due: January 18, 2000, Contact: Brian L. Anderson (907) 786–3379.

EIS No. 990426, Draft EIS, USA, CA, Oakland Army Base Disposal and Reuse Plan, Implementation, City of Oakland, Alameda County, CA, Due: January 03, 2000, Contact: Theresa Persick Arnold (703) 697–0216.

EIS No. 990427, Final EIS, NPS, CA, Redwood National and State Parks General Management Plan, Implementation, Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, CA, Due: December 20, 1999, Contact: Alan Schmierer (415) 427–1441.

EIS No. 990428, Final EIS, FRC, IL, MI, PA, IN, OH, NJ, Independence Pipeline and Market Link Expansion Projects, Construction and Operation, Interstate National Gas Pipeline, (Docket Nos. CP97–315–001, CP97–319–000, CP98–200–000 and CP98–540–000), NPDES and COE Section 404 Permits, IL, IN, MI, OH, PA and NJ, Due: December 20, 1999, Contact: Paul McKee (202) 208–1088.

EIS No. 990429, Draft EIS, FRC, MT, ID, Cabinet Gorge (No. 2058–014) and Noxon Rapids (No. 2075–014) Hydroelectric Project, Relicensing, MT and ID, Due: January 03, 2000, Contact: Bob Easton (202) 219–2782.

EIS No. 990430, Draft EIS, COE, AZ, Rio de Flag Flood Control Study, Improvement Flood Protection, City of Flagstaff, Coconino County, AZ, Due: January 04, 2000, Contact: David Compas (213) 452–3850.

EIS No. 990431, Draft EIS, FHW, OH, Meigs–124–21.16 Transportation Corridor, Relocating existing OH–124 and US 33, Meigs County, OH, Due: January 10, 2000, Contact: Timothy M. Hill (614) 644–0377.

EIS No. 990432, Final EIS, AFS, CO, Arapahoe Basin Ski Area Master Development Plan, Construction and Operation, COE Section 404 Permit, White River National Forest, Dillon Ranger District, Summit County, CO, Due: December 20, 1999, Contact: Michael Liu (970) 468–5400.

EIS No. 990433, Draft EIS, FTA, CA, Vasona Corridor Light Rail Transit Project, Extension of existing Light Rail Transit (LRT), in portion of the Cities of San Jose, Campbell and Los Gatos, Santa Clara County, CA, Due: January 03, 2000, Contact: Jerome Wiggins (415) 744–3115.

EIS No. 990434, Final EIS, DOE, CA, NM, TX, ID, SC, WA, Surplus Plutonium Disposition (DOE/EIS–0283) for Siting, Construction and Operation of three facilities for Plutonium Disposition, Possible Sites Hanford, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Pantex Plant and Savannah River, CA, ID, NM, SC, TX and WA, Due: December 20, 1999, Contact: G. Bert Stevenson (202) 586–5368.

Dated: November 16, 1999.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 99–30289 Filed 11–18–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6248–3]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared November 01, 1999 through November 05, 1999 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 10, 1999 (63 FR 17856).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–J65312–WY—Rating EO2, Squirrel Meadows—Grand Targhee Land Exchange Proposal, Implementation, Targhee National Forest, Teton County, WY.

Summary: EPA has environmental concerns about the lack of analysis on the direct and indirect impacts to wetlands and wildlife habitat from the additional development in proposed alternatives B, C, and D. Because the land exchange and resulting base area development are ''connected actions'' EPA believe a more detailed environmental analysis is required.

ERP No. D–AFS–K65219–CA—Rating EC2, Eldorado and Tahoe National Forests Land and Resource Management Plan, Standard and Guidelines for the Grazing Allotments, Implementation, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the potential resource shortfalls that might prevent monitoring and restoration activities as well as a lack of mandatory reductions in AUMs, elimination of grazing on specific allotments, or the triggering of additional protections when monitoring goals are not achieved.

ERP No. D–AFS–L65332–OR—Rating LO, Ashland Creek Watershed Protection Project, Proposal to Manage Vegetation, Rogue River National Forest, Ashland Ranger District, City of Ashland, Jackson County, OR.

Summary: EPA Region 10 used a screening tool to conduct a limited review of this action. Based upon the screen, EPA does not foresee having any environmental objections to the proposed project.

ERP No. D–FAA–A52169–00—Rating LO, Programmatic EIS—Commercial Launch Vehicles, Implementation, Issuing a Launch License.

Summary: EPA had no objection to the proposed action, although some text clarification suggestion were provided.

ERP No. D–FHW–J40151–WY—Rating EC2, Wyoming Forest Highway 23 Project, Louis Lake Road also known as Forest Development Road 300, Improvements from Bruce's Parking Lot to Worthen Meadow Road, Funding, NPDES Permits and COE Section 404 Permit, Shoshone National Forest, Fremont County, WY.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the analysis of cumulative/indirect impacts and the range of alternatives. EPA requested that mitigation be included to reduce erosion and sedimentation of adjacent water and also requested additional information on alternatives for the existing roadway and potential cumulative effects to wildlife in the Forest.

ERP No. D–FRC–L05220–WA—Rating EC2, Warm Creek (No. 10865) and Clearwater Creek (No. 11485) Hydroelectric Project, Issuance of License for the Construction and Operation, Located in the Middle Fork Nooksack River (MFNR) Basin, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns over the purpose and need for the projects, given their very small size; potential impacts to salmonids in the event of access above the Middle Fork Nooksack River diversion dam, which is downstream from the projects; and a lack of a true cost benefit analysis.

ERP No. DS–FHW–G50008–00—Rating EC2, Great River Bridge, Construction, US 65 in Arkansas to MS–8 in Mississippi, Funding, COE Section 404 Permit and US Coast Guard Bridge Permit, Desha and Arkansas Counties, AR and Bolivar County, MS.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding wetland and wildlife habitat impacts and the mitigation of these impacts. EPA requested that additional information be provided on these issues in the next document.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–AFS–L60106–ID, Long Prong Project, Timber Harvesting, Road Construction and Reconstruction, Boise National Forest, Cascade Ranger District, Valley County, ID.

Summary: No formal comment letter sent to the lead agency.

ERP No. F–AFS–L65290–ID, North Lochsa Face Landscape and Watershed Assessment Project, Implementation, Clearwater National Forest, Lochsa Ranger District, Idaho County, ID.

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

ERP No. F–AFS–L65303–WA, I–90 Land Exchange between Forest Service and Plum Creek, within the Vicinity of the Wenatchee, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie and Gifford Pinchot National Forests, Kittitas, King, Pierce, Lewis, Cowlitz and Skamania Counties, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed lack of objections.

ERP No. F–COE–L32010–OR, Columbia and Lower Willamette River Federal Navigation Channel,