be evaluated and may be implemented: (1) reduce or eliminate the invertebrate food source, (2) reconfigure raceway ponds to make them unattractive to the Hawaiian stilt, (3) net ponds to exclude Hawaiian stitl, (4) use biodegradable repellents, and (5) implement various hazing methods. Cyanotech will mitigate for incidental take of Hawaiian stilt eggs and chicks by creating suitable nesting habitat onsite. These measures would ensure (1) positive Hawaiian stilt reproductive success, (2) recruitment of fledged birds into the overall population, and (3) that the Cyanotech facility does not become a reproductive sink for stilts.

The Service's Proposed Action consists of the issuance of an incidental take permit and implementation of the HCP, which includes measures to minimize the incidental take of Hawaiian stilt eggs, chicks, subadults, and adults, and measures to mitigate any incidental take of Hawaiian stilts eggs and chicks at the Cyanotect facility. The four alternatives to the proposed alternative considered in the HCP are: (1) No Action, (2) Long-term Management Off Site, (3) Haze/Fee, and (4) Integrated Management Approach.

Under the No Action Alternative, no permit would be issued. Cyanotech would continue its microalgae operation without an HCP to address take of the Hawaiian stilt. Cyanotech did not select this option as it would be in violation of Section 9 of the Act.

Under the Long-term Management Off Site Alternative, Cyanotech would contribute funds to create, restore, or enhance habitat for Hawaiian stilt at an off site location. This alternative would provide mitigation for take of the Hawaiian stilt however, Cyanotech did not select this alternative due to the prepetutation of incidental take that would be caused by continued foraging and nesting of stilts at the Cyanotech facility.

Under the Haze/Fee Alternative, Cyanotech would haze Hawaiian stilts using non-lethal deterrents. This alternative may minimize take, however, Cyanotech did not select this alternative because hazing birds from a site has not proven effective as a long-term solution and would likely result in a long-term commitment of resources without reducing stilt numbers at the Cyanotech facility.

Under the Integrated Management Approach Alternative, Cyanotech would implement non-lethal bird deterrence, manage protected nesting habitat for 1 year only, and reallocate funds from on-site management to an off-site mitigation fund in years 2 and 3. Cyanotech did not select this alternative due to the unconditional closure of the on-site protected habitat after 1 year and the desire for flexibility provided by adaptive management.

The Service has made a preliminary determination that the Cyanotech HCP qualifies as a ''low-effect'' plan as defined by its Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook (November 1996). Our determination that a habitat conservation plan qualifies as a low-effect plan is based on the following three criteria: (1) Implementation of the plan would result in minor or negligible effects on federally listed, proposed, or candidate species and their habitats; (2) implementation of the plan would result in minor or negligible effects on other environmental values or resources; and (3) impacts of the plan, considered together with the impacts of other past, present and reasonable foreseeable similarly situated projects would not result, over time, in cumulative effects to environmental values or resources which would be considered significant. As more fully explained in our Environmental Action Statement, Cyanotech's HCP for the Hawaiian stilt qualifies as a ''low-effect'' plan for the following reasons:

1. Approval of the HCP would result in minor or negligible effects on the Hawaiian stilt. The Service does anticipate significant direct or cumulative effects to the Hawaiian stilt from Cyanotech's microalgae operation.

2. Approval of the HCP would not have adverse effects on unique geographic, historic, or cultural sites, or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.

3. Approval of the HCP would not result in any cumulative or growth inducing impacts and, therefore would not result in significant adverse effects on public health or safety.

4. The HCP does not require compliance with Executive Order 11998 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, nor does it threaten or violate a Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

5. Approval of the HCP would not establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.

We provide this notice pursuant to section 10(c) of the Act and pursuant to implementing regulations for the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR 1506.6). We will evaluate the permit application, HCP, and comments submitted thereon to determine whether the permit application meets the requirements of section 10(a) of the Act and National Policy Act regulations. If we determine that the requirements are met, we will issue a permit under section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Act to Cyanotech for take of Hawaiian stilt incidental to otherwise lawful activities in accordance with the HCP. We will fully consider all comments received during the comment period and will not make our final decision until after the end of the 30-day comment period.

Dated: December 18, 2001.

Rowan W. Gould,

Deputy Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon.

[FR Doc. 01–32142 Filed 12–31–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[WO–220–1020–PB–24 1A; OMB Approval Number 1004–0005]

Information Collection Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has submitted the proposed collection information listed below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*). On August 21, 2001, the BLM published a notice in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 43901) requesting comments on this proposed collection. The comment period ended on October 22, 2001. The BLM received no comments from the public in response to that notice. You may obtain copies of the proposed collection of information and related forms and explanatory material by contacting the BLM Information Collection Clearance Officer at the telephone number listed below.

The OMB is required to respond to this request within 60 days but may respond after 30 days. For maximum consideration your comments and suggestions on the requirement should be made within 30 days directly to the Office of Management and Budget, Interior Department Desk Officer (1004–0005), Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Washington, DC 20503. Please provide a copy of your comments to the Bureau Information Collection Clearance Officer (WO–630), 1849 C St., NW, Mail Stop 401 LS, Washington, DC 20240.

Nature of Comments

We specifically request your comments on the following:

1. Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper functioning of the BLM, including whether the information will have practical utility;

2. The accuracy of the BLM's estimate of the burden of collecting the information, including the validity and methodology and assumptions used;

3. The quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and

4. How to minimize the burden of collecting the information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other forms of information technology.

Title: Grazing Application-Grazing Schedule (43 CFR 4130).

OMB Approval Number: 1004–0005.

Bureau Form Number: 4130–1.

Abstract: The Bureau of Land Management uses the information to provide the opportunity for grazing operators to apply for changes to the grazing schedules in their BLM authorized grazing leases or permits.

Frequency: On occasion.

Description of Respondents: Holders of BLM-issued grazing leases and permits.

Estimated Completion Time: 20 minutes.

Annual Responses: 6,000.

Application Fee per Response: 0. There is no filing fee.

Annual Burden Hours: 2,000.

Bureau Clearance Officer: Michael Schwartz, (202) 452–5033.

Dated: December 11, 2001.

Michael H. Schwartz,

BLM Information Collection Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 01–32126 Filed 12–31–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–84–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[CA–660–1430–ER–CACA–43368]

Proposed Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the San Diego Gas And Electric Company Valley-Rainbow 500 kV Interconnect Project, CA

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

ACTION: Notice of Intent to prepare a joint EIS/EIR addressing the proposed Valley-Rainbow 500–kV Interconnect Project; an electrical transmission line project.

SUMMARY: In compliance with regulations at 40 CFR 1501.7 and 43 CFR 1610.2, notice is hereby given that the BLM, together with the CPUC, propose to direct the preparation of a joint EIS/EIR for the 500 kilovolt (kV) Valley-Rainbow Interconnect Project, proposed by the San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E). The BLM is the lead Federal agency for the preparation of this EIS/EIR in compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulation for implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500–1508), and the Department of the Interior's manual guidance on NEPA; and the CPUC is the lead State of California agency for the preparation of this EIS/EIR in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et. seq.*), and implementing guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 14, Section 15000 *et. seq.*), and CPUC's Rules and Regulations to Implement CEQA. This notice initiates the public scoping for the EIS and also serves as an invitation for other cooperating agencies. Potential cooperating agencies include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the State Historic Preservation Officer, U.S. Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Fish and Game.

DATES: For scoping meeting and comments: One NEPA public scoping openhouse will be held during 2002 on the following date: January 8, 2002, from 3:00 pm to 8:00 pm, at the Comfort Inn, 27338 Jefferson Ave., Temecula, California.

Written comments must be postmarked no later than 30 days from the date of this notice in order to be included in the draft EIR/EIS. Please submit any comments to the address listed below.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Mr. James G. Kenna, Field Manager, Bureau of Land Management, Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office, 690 West Garnet Ave, P.O. Box 581260, North Palm Springs, California 92258–1260.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Kalish, Bureau of Land Management, Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office, 690 West Garnet Ave, P.O. Box 581260, North Palm Springs, California 92258–1260, (760) 251–4849.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Valley-Rainbow 500 kV Interconnect Project is proposed by SDG&E to provide an interconnection between SDG&E's existing 230 kV transmission system at the proposed Rainbow Substation, on Rainbow Heights Road near the unincorporated community of Rainbow in San Diego County, and the Southern California Edison's (SCE) existing 500 kV transmission system at the Valley Substation on Menifee Road in the unincorporated community of Romoland in Riverside County. The project area is located entirely in California within northern San Diego County and western Riverside County.

This project consists of the following new or expanded electric transmission and substation facilities. A single circuit 500 kV electric transmission line approximately 31 miles in length would connect a proposed new SDG&E 500 kV/230 kV bulk power transmission substation near the community of Rainbow, San Diego County to SCE's Valley substation near Romoland, Riverside County. The proposed 500 kV transmission line would be built on steel poles and lattice towers within a new right-of-way. To support this proposed 500 kV Interconnect system, a second 230 kV circuit would be added to the existing Talega to Escondido 230 kV transmission line on the U.S. Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton and private lands within San Diego County. This proposed second 230 kV circuit would be placed on existing steel supported structures. A 7.7 mile section of an existing 69kV transmission circuit, currently installed on one side of the Talega-Escondido 230 kV transmission line structures, would be rebuilt on new structures within the existing right-of-way between SDG&E's Pala and Lilac Substations, San Diego County. Voltage support upgrades to SDG&E's existing Mission, Miguel and Sycamore Canyon substations would also be needed.

The CPUC held public scoping meetings from July 10–12, 2001 in the communities of Temecula, Winchester and Pauma Valley and accepted comments from June 30 through August 7, 2001. The BLM actively participated in this State scoping process as the lead Federal agency. The State scoping process resulted in substantial comment that is broadly summarized as involving environmental issues and concerns, growth inducement, purpose and need for the project and alternatives. Possible impacts to quality of life, property values, visual and aesthetic qualities of the area, wine making and other agricultural operations, placement of schools and parks, community and residential development, recreation including hot air ballooning and human health were addressed by the public. In addition to these concerns, the BLM has identified issues related to wildlife,