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]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

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.

ERP 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.