collected via a mechanism known as the Hazardous Waste Report for the required reporting year [EPA Form 8700–13 A/B](also known as the Biennial Report). Both RCRA Sections 3002 and 3004 require EPA to establish standards for recordkeeping and reporting of hazardous waste generation and management. Section 3002 applies to hazardous waste generators and Section 3004 applies to hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities. The implementing regulations are found at 40 CFR 262.40(b) and (d); 262.41(a)(1)–(5), (a)(8), and (b); 264.75(a)–(e) and (j); 265.75(a)–(e) and (j); and 270.30(l)(9). This is mandatory reporting by the respondents.

This ICR renewal includes several changes to the RCRA Subtitle C Site Identification Form (EPA Form 8700–12) in order to implement two new final rules: The *Revisions to the Definition of Solid Waste*, promulgated on October 30, 2008 (73 FR 64668); and the *Standards Applicable to Generators of Hazardous Waste; Alternative Requirements for Hazardous Waste Determination and Accumulation of Unwanted Material at Laboratories Owned by Colleges and Universities and Other Eligible Academic Entities Formally Affiliated With Colleges and Universities*, promulgated on December 1, 2008 (73 FR 72912).

Burden Statement: The reporting burden is estimated to average 16.4 hours per respondent, and includes time for reviewing instructions, gathering data, completing and reviewing the forms, and submitting the report. The record keeping requirement is estimated to average 2.3 hours per response and includes the time for filing and storing the Biennial Report submission for three years.

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 which have subsequently changed; 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.

The ICR provides a detailed explanation of the Agency's estimate, which is only briefly summarized here:

Estimated total number of potential respondents: 13,000.

Frequency of response: Once.

Estimated total average number of responses for each respondent: 50.

Estimated total annual burden hours: 700,000 hours.

Estimated total annual costs: $70,000 annualized capital or O&M costs.

What Is the Next Step in the Process for This ICR?

EPA will consider the comments received and amend the ICR as appropriate. The final ICR package will then be submitted to OMB for review and approval pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.12. At that time, EPA will issue another **Federal Register** notice pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.5(a)(1)(iv) to announce the submission of the ICR to OMB and the opportunity to submit additional comments to OMB. If you have any questions about this ICR or the approval process, please contact the technical person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Dated: February 26, 2009.

Matt Hale,

Director, Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery.

[FR Doc. E9–11410 Filed 5–14–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–8593–5]

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 202–564–7146.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 17, 2009 (74 FR 17860).

Draft EISs

EIS No. 20090052, ERP No. D–NRS–H38001–IA, Clarke County Water Supply Project, To Construct a Multiple-Purpose Structure that Provides for Rural Water Supply and Water Based Recreational Opportunities, Clarke County, IA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about stream and wetland impacts and mitigation. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20090064, ERP No. D–FTA–K54031–CA, Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor Project, Proposes to Construct an Extension of the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Rail System from Warm Spring Station in Fremont to Santa Clara County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to water quality, noise impacts, and environmental justice. EPA also recommended that the project sponsors ensure coordination with other transit service in the area. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20090076, ERP No. D–SFW–K91016–CA, Paiute Cutthroat Trout Restoration Project, Eradication of Non-Native Trout Species from 11 Stream Miles of Silver King Creek, Alpine County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns about the environmental impacts of piperonyl butoxide, and recommended further consideration of physical treatment combined with chemical treatment options. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20090082, ERP No. D–AFS–K65359–CA, Salt Timber Harvest and Fuel Hazard Reduction Project, Proposing Vegetation Management in the Salt Creek Watershed, South Fork Management Unit, Hayfork Ranger District, Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Trinity County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the treatment prescriptions, naturally occurring asbestos, air quality, and climate change. Rating EC2.

Final EISs

EIS No. 20090041, ERP No. F–TVA–E65073–IN, Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan, Amend and Update the 2005 Plan, Guide Land Use Approvals, Private Water Use Facility, and Resource Management Decisions, Loudon, Meigs, Rhea and Roane Counties, TN.

Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns because the preferred alternative Modified B is not as environmental protective as the Modified C alternative.

EIS No. 20090073, ERP No. F–USN–D11044–00, Virginia Capes (VACAPES) Range Complex, Proposed action is to Support and Conduct Current and Emerging Training and RDT & E Operations, Chesapeake Bay, DE, MD, VA and NC.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the

deposition of expended training materials into the marine environment and its potential impact over time.

EIS No. 20090074, ERP No. F–FAA–F51051–OH, Port Columbus International Airport/(CMH) Project, Replacement of Runway 10R/28L, Development of a New Passenger Terminal and other Associated Airport Projects, Funding, City of Columbus, OH.

Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns about PM2.5 emissions, and how they will be minimized.

EIS No. 20090081, ERP No. F–AFS–L65559–OR, BLT Project, Proposed Vegetation Management Activities, Crescent Ranger District, Deschutes National Forest, Deschutes County, OR.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action.

EIS No. 20090089, ERP No. F–AFS–K65338–AZ, Warm Fire Recovery Project, Removal of Fire-Killed Trees Reforestation, Fuel Reduction and Road Reconstruction of Wildland Fire Burn Portion, Coconino County, AZ.

Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns about potential impacts to water resources and wildlife habitat from erosion.

EIS No. 20090093, ERP No. F–FHW–H40193–IA, I–29 Improvements in Sioux City, Construction from Burlington Northern Santa Fe Rail Road (BNSF) Bridge over the Missouri River to Existing Hamilton Boulevard Interchange, Woodbury County, IA.

Summary: While EPA does not object to the proposed action, it requested clarification of water and sanitary sewer line relocation and abandonment issues.

EIS No. 20090096, ERP No. FS–COE–G34043–LA, Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC) Lock Replacement Project, Proposal for Relieving Navigation Traffic Congestion Associated with IHNC Lock, Located between the St. Claude Avenue and North Claibone Avenue Bridge, Orleans, LA.

Summary: EPA does not object to the preferred alternative.

EIS No. 20090103, ERP No. FS–NOA–K91008–00, Amendment 18 to the Fishery Management Plan, Pelagic Fisheries of the Western Pacific Region, Management Modifications for the Hawaii-based Shallow-set Longline Swordfish Fishery, Proposal to Remove Effort Limits, Eliminate the Set Certificate Program and Implement New Sea Turtle Interaction Caps.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed project, but suggests that the conservation recommendations outlined in the Biological Opinion be included in the Record of Decision.

Dated: May 12, 2009.

Robert W. Hargrove,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. E9–11398 Filed 5–14–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–8593–4]

Environmental Impacts Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information, (202) 564–7167 or *http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/*.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements filed 05/04/2009 through 05/08/2009 pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 20090150, Revised Draft EIS, FHW, IN, I–69 Evansville to Indianapolis, Indiana Project, Section 2, Revised to Update the Stream Impacts, Oakland City to Washington, (IN–64 to US 50), Gibson, Pike and Daviess Counties, IN, Comment Period Ends: 06/29/2009, Contact: Janice Osadczuk, 317–226–7486.

EIS No. 20090151, Draft EIS, NPS, CA, Prisoners Harbor Coastal Wetland Restoration Project, Proposes to Restore a Functional, Self-Sustaining Ecosystem at a Coastal Wetland Site, Channel Islands National Park, Santa Cruz Island, Santa Barbara County, CA, Comment Period Ends: 07/13/2009, Contact: Paula Power, 805–658–5784.

EIS No. 20090152, Draft EIS, BLM, UT, Mona to Oquirrh Transmission Corridor Project and Draft Pong Express Resource Management Plan Amendment, Construction, Operation, Maintenance and Decommissioning a Double-Circuit 500/345 Kilovolt (Kv) Transmission Line, Right-of-Way Grant, Rocky Mountain Power, Juab, Salt Lake, Tooele and Utah Counties, UT, Comment Period Ends: 08/03/2009, Contact: Mike Nelson, 801–977–4300.

Dated: May 12, 2009.

Robert W. Hargrove,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. E9–11395 Filed 5–14–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE U.S.

[Public Notice 114]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request, Marketing Fax Back Response Form

AGENCY: Export-Import Bank of the U.S.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Export-Import Bank invites the general public and other Federal Agencies to comment on the proposed information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The Marketing Fax Back Response Form will be used to collect basic trade information about United States companies. This information will be provided to the Export-Import Bank's finance consultants nationwide to assist in providing counsel to exporters.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 14, 2009 to be considered.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments and requests for additional information to Stephen Maroon, Export-Import Bank of the U.S., 811 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20571, (202) 565–3901, or *stephen.maroon@exim.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title and Form Number: Marketing Fax Back Response Form EIB 05–01.

OMB Number: 3048–.

Type of Review: Regular.

Need and Use: This form will provide basic trade information about U.S. Companies and will provide the Export-Import Bank's trade finance consultants nationwide the ability to provide counsel to exporters.

Affected Public: The form affects entities involved in the export of U.S. goods and services.

Estimated Annual Respondents: 1,500.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 5 minutes.

Estimated Annual Burden: 125 hours.

Frequency of Reporting or Use: Once.

BILLING CODE 6690–01–P