(6) NESHAP Subpart M, Dry Cleaning Facilities/Perchloroethylene (PCE), EPA ICR Number 1415.04, and OMB Control Number 2060.0234 Expires February 28, 2000

Affected Entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are those which are subject to NESHAP Subpart M, owners or operators of dry cleaning facilities using Perchloroethylene (PCE) as a solvent.

Abstract: The information collected is needed to determine which sources are subject to the regulation and whether these sources are in compliance with the standards. EPA is required under Section 112(d) of the Clean Air Act (Act) to regulate emissions of 189 hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) listed in Section 112(b) of the Act. One of these pollutants, PCE, is emitted from dry cleaning facilities. In the Administrator's judgement, PCE emitted from dry cleaning facilities causes, or contributes significantly, to the air pollution that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health. Consequently, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant (NESHAP) for this source category have been developed. Certain records and reports are necessary to enable the Administrator to identify sources subject to the standards and to ensure that standard, which is based on maximum achievable control technology (MACT) or generally achievable control technology (GACT), is being achieved. The Agency will use the information to identify sources subject to the standards to ensure that MACT or GACT is being properly applied, monitoring is being conducted on a weekly basis to ensure that the emission control devices are being properly operated and maintained on a continuous basis to reduce vented PCE emissions, and leak detection and repair are being conducted on a weekly basis to reduce fugitive PCE emissions. The records and reports are necessary to enable the EPA to identify facilities that may not be in compliance with the standard. Based on reported information, the EPA can decide which facilities should be inspected/receive compliance assistance, and what records or processors should be inspected at these facilities. The records that the facilities maintain would indicate to the EPA whether they are operating and maintaining equipment properly to control vented emissions and whether transfer emissions and other fugitive emissions are being properly controlled. To minimize the burden, much of the information the Agency needs to determine compliance would be recorded and retained on site at the facility. Such information would be reviewed by enforcement/compliance assistance personnel during an inspection and would not need to be routinely reported to the EPA.

The recordkeeping and reporting requirements under Subpart M are mandatory under 40 CFR 63.324. These requirements include the 5 year retention of records (40 CFR 63.324(d)). In addition to the general provision requirements there are records of solvent purchase per month (40 CFR 63.324(d)(1)), records of calculation and results of yearly PCE consumption (40 CFR 63.324(d)(2)), records of weekly or biweekly inspections (40 CFR 63.324(d)(3)), records of dates of repair or purchase orders (40 CFR 63.324(d)(4)), records of monitoring (40 CFR 63.324(d)(5) and (6)), initial report requirements (all) (40 CFR 63.324(a)), report on compliance (40 CFR 63.324(b)), report on facility status change to major source (40 CFR 63.324(c)), report on exceedance of low solvent consumption exemption level (40 CFR 63.324(c)).

Burden Statement: Since the dry cleaning industry is considered to be comprised primarily of small businesses, the EPA took special steps to ensure that the burdens imposed on the small businesses were reasonable. There are an estimated 25,090 affected facilities. The previous ICR estimated the annual public reporting burden for this collection of information as an average 9 hours per response for new dry cleaning facilities and zero hours per response for existing dry cleaning facilities. The public recordkeeping burden was estimated to average 48 hours per respondent for a total 1,192,879 hours.

(7) NESHAP (National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants Subpart DD, Off-Site Waste and Recovery Operations, EPA ICR Number 1717.02, OMB Control Number 2060–0313, Expires March 31, 2000

Affected entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are certain types of waste management facilities that are ''major sources,'' as defined in section 112(b) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), and receive from other facilities wastes containing specific organic compounds listed as hazardous air pollutants (HAPs).

Abstract: This ICR contains record keeping and reporting requirements that are specifically authorized by Section 14 of the CA (42 U.S.C. 7414) and set out in the NESHAP General Provisions. This information is used by Agency to: (1) identify major sources and newly constructed sources subject to the standards; (2) ensure that maximum achievable control technol (MACT) is being properly applied; and (3) ensure that the emission control devices are being properly operated and maintained on a continuous basis. The records that the facility is required to maintain would indicate to the Agency whether facility personnel are operating and maintaining control of equipment properly. Owners or operators of the affected facilities described must make the following one-time reports: Notification of the date of construction or reconstruction; notification of the anticipated and actual dates of startup; notification of any physical or operational change to an existing facility which may increase the regulated pollution emission rate; notification of the date of the initial performance test; and the results of the initial performance test. Owners or operators are also required to maintain records of the occurrence and duration of any startup, shutdown, or malfunction in the operation of an affected facility, or any period during which the monitoring system is inoperative. The standards require periodic record keeping to document process information relating to the sources' ability to meet the requirements of the standard and to note the operational conditions under which compliance was achieved.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and record keeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 208 hours per response.

Dated: October 4, 1999.

Bruce R. Weddle,

Director, Office of Compliance.

[FR Doc. 99–28041 Filed 10–28–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6466–7]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Extension of Application Requirements for the Approval and Delegation of Federal Air Toxics Programs to State, Territorial, Local, and Tribal Agencies

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that EPA is planning to submit the

following continuing Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB): Application Requirements for the Approval and Delegation of Federal Air Toxics Programs to State, Territorial, Local, and Tribal Agencies, OMB No. 2060–0264, ICR no. 1643.04, expiration date currently 3/31/2000. Before submitting this ICR to OMB for review and approval, EPA is soliciting comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection as described below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before December 28, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Send all comments on this ICR to Ms. Holly Reid, Information Transfer and Program Integration Division (MD–12), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711. Interested persons may obtain a copy of the ICR without charge by contacting Ms. Yulonda Thorpe, at (919) 541–5319.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Holly Reid, (919) 541–5344, or electronic mail at reid.holly@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Affected entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are those State, Territorial, Local, and Tribal agencies (S/L/Ts) participating in this voluntary program.

Title: Application Requirements for the Approval and Delegation of Federal Air Toxics Programs to State, Territorial, Local, and Tribal Agencies, OMB No. 2060–0264 (ICR No. 1643.04), Expiration date March 31, 2000.

Abstract: A rule developed under the authority of section 112(l) of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990, calls for us, EPA, to ''publish guidance that would be useful to States in developing programs * * * allowing for delegation of the Administrator's authorities and responsibilities to implement and enforce emissions standards and prevention requirements.'' Affected entities include S/L/Ts choosing to participate in this voluntary program. No industries are included among the respondents.

The ICR reflects the approval process codified in 40 CFR 63, subpart E, which we proposed to amend on January 12, 1999 (64 FR 1880). Under the amended process, the S/L/T can select one of five delegation options to implement and enforce the Federal section 112 rule, requirement, or program. These options include:

—Accepting straight delegation of the unchanged Federal standard;
—Requesting an adjustment to the Federal standard;
—Requesting to substitute S/L/T requirements or rules for the Federal standard;
—Requesting to substitute Title V permit or Title V general permit terms and conditions for the Federal standard; or,
—Requesting to substitute an S/L/T program for the Federal standard.

In addition, the S/L/T may also request delegation of the 40 CFR part 68 accidental release prevention program using subpart E. When the S/L/T requests to adjust or substitute requirements under subpart E, they must demonstrate that their changes are as least as stringent as the Federal standard they would replace.

The approval options vary in the types of changes allowed and in the level of demonstrations required for approval. Respondents interested in using this program must submit an application package to their EPA Regional Office. We will use this information to determine whether the S/L/T request is approvable according to the criteria specified in subpart E. The intent of this voluntary program is to encourage S/L/Ts to accept delegation of the Federal section 112 standards, and to allow them to adjust or substitute S/L/T requirements when they can be shown to be at least as stringent as the Federal requirements. These provisions for alternatives will help preserve existing S/L/T programs and prevent dual regulation of sources.

We also reserve the right to review and withdraw an approved S/L/T rule, program, or requirement if we decide it is not as stringent as the otherwise applicable Federal standard or if the S/L/T is failing to adequately implement or enforce it. In this case, the S/L/T would be asked to submit information regarding permits, monitoring, resources, etc. We will use this information to decide if the rule, program, or requirement should be withdrawn. Our ability to review and withdraw approval is needed to ensure we can satisfy our obligations under the Act to implement and enforce the section 112 requirements.

This collection of information is authorized under 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q. We will safeguard any information we obtain for which a claim of confidentiality is made according to our policies outlined in title 40, chapter 1, part 2, subpart B, Confidentiality of Business Information.

Note that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for our regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15.

We would like to solicit comments to:

—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;
—Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
—Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; or,
—Minimize the burden of the collection of information on S/L/Ts, 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: 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; 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.

We estimate that the amended subpart E program will pose an overall average burden on all respondents of 130,198 hours and $5.3 million per year. We estimate that each of the 127 S/L/Ts subject to subpart E may request delegation for up to 35 section 112(d) standards per year during the 3-year approval period we are requesting for this collection. In addition to delegations of the section 112(d) standards, the total costs include the one-time request for approval to receive delegation, requests for up-front approval to use the equivalency by permit and State program approval options, the one-time request to take delegation of the accidental release prevention program during the 3-year

period, and the effort for S/L/Ts to respond to our decision to withdraw up to two approved rules, programs, or requirements in year 3. Therefore, the average annual burden for each S/L/T is 29 hours and $1,194 per response.

The cost estimate is based on the labor costs for S/L/Ts to request delegation under the various options in subpart E and to respond to potential program withdrawal reviews by us. There are no separate capital/startup costs associated with the final rule.

Dated: October 15, 1999.

Richard A. Wayland,

Acting Director, Information Transfer and Program Integration Division.

[FR Doc. 99–28391 Filed 10–28–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6247–6]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared October 11, 1999 Through October 15, 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–J65308–UT Rating EC2, Wasatch Powderbird Guides Permit Renewal, Proposal to Conduct Guided Helicopter Skiing Activities on National Forest System Land, Issuance of a Special-Use-Permit, Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Uinta National Forest, Salt Lake County, UT.

Summary: EPA expressed concern regarding potential wildlife impacts, air quality impacts and human disturbance from helicopter noise. EPA requested that these issues be addressed in the final EIS.

ERP No. D–AFS–J65309–UT Rating EC2, Trout Slope East Timber Project, Timber Harvest and Associated Activities, Implementation, Vernal Ranger District, Ashley National Forest, Uintah County, UT.

Summary: EPA requested additional information on sediment control procedures and water quality to fully assess impacts from the Preferred Alternative.

ERP No. D–AFS–L65325–ID Rating EC2, Sloan-Kennally Timber Sale, Proposal to Harvest and Regenerate Timber Strands, Implementation, Payette National Forest, McCall Ranger District, Valley County, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding lack of information with how this project relates to TMDL efforts and the construction of roads in a roadless area. EPA requested that information be provided on any expectations of the Payette National Forest to help implement any TMDL and that an explanation be provided on why entry into a roadless area cannot be avoided.

ERP No. D–AFS–L65327–WA Rating EC2, Stimson ANILCA Access Easement Project, Reconstruct and Construct, Colville National Forest, Sullivan Lake Ranger District, Pend Oreille County, WA.

Summary: EPA identified concerns with the purpose and need, the treatment of reasonably foreseeable actions. the characterization of impacts to grizzly bears from Alternative C, and the lack of baseline information. EPA recommended that a revised purpose and need statement be developed, and that additional baseline information and analyses be included in the final EIS.

ERP No. D–COE–E39037–TN Rating EC2, Reelfoot Lake Project, Implementation of Wetland Preservation, Waterfowl Habitat Restoration, Fishery Improvement, Lake and Obion Counties, TN and Fulton County, KY.

Summary: The restoration measures proposed should result in significant long term environmental benefits. EPA requested the collection of additional information to determine how design features will be installed.

ERP No. D–FHW–C40148–NY Rating EC2, Miller Highway Project (P.I.N. 103.27), Relocation of Miller Highway between West 59th Street to West 72nd Streets, on the Upper West Side of Manhattan, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, New York County, NY.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the lack of characterization of the contaminated materials at the areas of concern. EPA requested that these issues be address in the final document.

ERP No. D–FHW–G40152–LA Rating EC2, North-South Expressway Const. I–220 in Shreveport, LA to the Arkansas State Line, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit Issuance, Caddo Parish, LA.

Summary: EPA has environmental concerns in the areas of impacts on transportation, air quality, construction, induced growth/secondary economic impacts, impacts to oil and gas facilities, agriculture, property values, and other resources. EPA requested that these issues be clarified.

ERP No. D–FTA–C53004–NY Rating LO, Mid-Harlem Line Third Track Project, Construct a New 2.5 mile Third Track between Fleetwood and Crestwood Stations, Funding, Westchester County, NY.

Summary: EPA has no objection to the project as proposed.

ERP No. D–NPS–L65328–WA Vancouver National Historic Reserve Cooperative Management Plan, Preservation, Education and Public Use, Implementation, Clark County, City of Vancouver, WA.

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

ERP No. D–SFW–L64046–WA Rating LO, Little Pend Oreille National Wildlife Refuge, Implementation, Comprehensive Conservation Plan, Stevens and Pend Oreille Counties, WA.

Summary: EPA is pleased to see that the USFWS has developed a plan that incorporates better management and protection of the natural resources while maintaining and in some cases, enhancing the recreational uses within the refuge.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–AFS–J65298–CO South Fork Salvage Analysis Area, Implementation, Routt Divide Blowdown, Land and Resource Management Plan, Medicine Bow-Routt National Forests, Hahns Peak/Bears Ears Ranger District, Rounty County, CO.

Summary: EPA review finds the alternative selected can be implemented without significant impact to the environment, therefore EPA has no objection to the proposed action.

ERP No. F–BLM–J65294–UT Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Management Plan, Implementation, Cedar City, UT.

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

ERP No. F–FHW–H40155–MO MO–13 and MO–7 Highway/Freeway Improvements, MO–13 from US 24 in Lexington to Truman Reservoir south of Clinton and MO–7 in the immediate area of Clinton, Funding, Lafayette, Johnson and Henry Counties, MO.

Summary: EPA concerns expressed in 1995 have been adequately addressed in the FEIS.