competitive process, ten (10) State cooperative agreement awardees are required to measure the results/impacts of their innovative developmental work and outreach efforts. In order to do this, some, but not all, awardees will need to solicit information from the small business community that voluntarily use these programs. This information will be confidential. This is a ''generic'' information request (ICR) to enable some of the 10 State SBO or SBAP Programs to collect information on the results/effectiveness of their projects so that the States and EPA can better understand which types of outreach were most effective. State SBOs/SBAPs and EPA are interested in judging the results of various measurement methods such as via comment/response cards, on-site interviews, mailed/Internet-surveys/on-site questionnaires and, telephone surveys.

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 EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15. The **Federal Register** document required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on 04/18/00 (FR Vol. 65, No. 75); pages 20819–20. No comments were received.

EPA would like to again 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 proposed for the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of future information to be collected; and

(iv) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are responding, 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: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection is estimated to average 1.1 hours per response. 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; adjusting 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.

Respondents/Affected Entities: Owners and operators within the water heater and boiler manufacturing industry, reinforced plastics and boat manufacturing industry, gasoline dispensing sites and transport vehicles, auto repair and salvage yards, and others.

Respondents/Affected Entities: 3,900.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 3,900.

Frequency of Response: once per respondent.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 4,200.

Estimated Total Annualized & Capital Cost Burden: 0.

Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including through the use of automated collection techniques to the following addresses. Please refer to EPA ICR No. 1958.01 in any correspondence.

Dated: August 28, 2000.

Oscar Morales,

Director, Collection Strategies Division.

[FR Doc. 00–22524 Filed 8–31–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6610–5]

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 21, 2000 Through August 25, 2000 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 000293, FINAL EIS, NPS, MT, Lake McDonald/Park Headquarters Wastewater Treatment System Rehabilitation, Implementation, COE Section 404 Permit, Glacier National Park, A Portion of Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park, Flathead and Glacier Counties, MT, Due: October 02, 2000, Contact: Mary Riddle (406) 888–7898.

EIS No. 000294, FINAL SUPPLEMENT, COE, MO, St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway Project, Channel Enlargement and Improvement, Flood Control, National Economic Development (NED) New Madrid, Mississippi and Scott Counties, MO, Due: October 02, 2000, Contact: John Rumancik (901) 544–3975.

EIS No. 000295, FINAL EIS, AFS, PA, Duck and Sheriff Project Area (DSPA), Timber Management, Road Construction and Reconstruction, Trail Maintenance, Wildlife Habitat Improvement, and Recreation Management, Allegheny National Forest, Bradford Ranger District, Cherry Grove Township of Warren County, and Howe Township of Forest County, PA, Due: October 02, 2000, Contact: John Schultz (814) 362–4613.

EIS No. 000296, REVISED DRAFT EIS, AFS, CA, Programmatic EIS-Ansel Adams, John Muir and Dinkey Lakes Wildernesses, Proposed New Management Direction, Amending the Land and Resource Management Plans for the Inyo and Sierra National Forests, Implementation, Inyo, Madera, Mono and Fresno Counties, CA, Due: December 01, 2000, Contact: Mary Beth Hennessy (760) 873–2448.

EIS No. 000297, DRAFT EIS, AFS, OR, Rimrock Ecosystem Restoration Project, To Promote Healthy and Sustainable Watershed Conditions, Implementation, Umatilla National Forest, Heppner Ranger District, Grant, Morrow and Wheeler Counties, OR, Due: October 16, 2000, Contact: Andrei Rykoff (541) 678–9187.

EIS No. 000298, FINAL EIS, FHW, OH, Lancaster Bypass (FAI–US 22/US 33–9.59/9.95) Construction, Funding, Greenfield, Hocking, Berne and Pleasant Townships, Fairfield County, OH, Due: October 02, 2000, Contact: Leonard E. Brown (614) 280–6896.

EIS No. 000299, FINAL EIS, BIA, CA, Cortina Integrated Solid Waste Management Project, Development and Operation, Approval of Land Lease Cortina Indian Rancheria of Wintin Indians, Colusa County, CA, Due: October 02, 2000, Contact: William Allan (916) 978–6043.

EIS No. 000300, DRAFT EIS, BLM, NV, Newmont Gold Mining, South Operations Area Project Amendment, Operation and Expansion, Plan of Operations, Elko and Eureka Counties, NV, Due: October 31, 2000, Contact: Roger Congdon (775) 753–0200.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 000282, DRAFT EIS, MMS, TX, MS, FL, LA, AL, Programmatic EIS—Proposed Use of Floating Production, Storage and Offloading Systems on the Gulf of Mexico, Outer Continental Shelf, Western and Central Planning Areas, TX, LA, MS, AL and FL, Due: October 10, 2000, Contact: Archie Melancon (703) 787–1547.

Revision of FR notice published on 08/18/2000: CEQ Comment Date corrected from 10/20/2000 to 10/10/2000.

EIS No. 000284, DRAFT EIS, NPS, MD, Glen Echo Park Management Plan, Implementation, Town of Glen Echo, Potomac River Valley, part of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, Montgomery County, MD, Due: October 16, 2000, Contact: Audrey Calhoun (703) 289–2500.

Revision of FR Notice Published on 08/18/2000: Correction of CEQ Comment Due Date from 10/17/2000 to 10/16/2000 and Correction of agency from GSA to NPS.

Dated: August 29, 2000.

Joseph C. Montgomery,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 00–22552 Filed 8–31–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6610–6]

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) 564–7167. An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 14, 2000 (65 FR 20157).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–K65226–00 Rating EO2, Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Project, Implementation, several counties, CA and NV.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections based on problems with purpose and need, alternative development, water and air quality impacts, analysis of cumulative effects, and the relationship of the Forest Plan Amendment to the Quincy pilot project. EPA offered specific suggestions and requests that the final EIS address the issues addressed above as well as the decision to defer consideration of strategies to address adverse impacts associated with the Forest Service road system in the planning area.

ERP No. D–AFS–L65357–ID Rating EC2, East Beaver and Miner's Creek Timber Sales and Prescribed Burning Project, Implementation, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Dubois Ranger District, Clark County, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed concern with the preferred alternative due to potential impacts to aquatic ecosystem health and lack of data/analysis to support conclusions; uncertain funding of restoration/mitigation projects upon which impact analyses were based; and the aggressive approach to prescribed burning that may not achieve intended goals.

ERP No. D–AFS–L65360–AK Rating EC2, Madan Timber Sale, Implementation, Tongass National Forest, Wrangell Ranger District, COE Section 404 Permit and NPDES Permit, AK.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns about the potential impacts from roads and Log Transfer Facilities (LTFs) to water quality, aquatic resources, and wildlife in the project area. EPA recommends that the EIS clarify proposed road maintenance activities, try to realign roads to avoid wetlands, and decommission roads following harvesting. In addition, EPA recommends that hardened surfaces be placed at permanent LTF sites to help capture spilled fuels and that the Forest Service consult with National Marine Fisheries Service about the potential impacts of LTFs to Essential Fish Habitat.

ERP No. D–AFS–L65361–ID Rating EC2, Myrtle-Cascade Project, Implementation of Resource Management Activities, Idaho Panhandle National Forests, Bonners Ferry Ranger District, Boundary County, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns about impacts to water quality from proposed reconstruction of roads without a commensurate commitment of funds to maintain or obliterate those roads, and about declines in woodland caribou populations that occurred recently, and the potential impacts of the project to the caribou population in the area. EPA recommends that the EIS discuss in greater detail the effect on water quality if obliteration is not funded and the impacts on woodland caribou from project implementation.

ERP No. D–COE–K39061–CA Rating EC2, Rancho Palos Verdes Restoration Project, Implementation, City of Rancho Palos Verdes, Los Angeles County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the water quality impacts projected to occur with construction and operation of the dike, and because the Corps did not evaluate alternatives that would avoid or minimize the placement of dredged or fill material in waters of the United States. EPA expressed additional concerns regarding potential air quality impacts, cumulative impacts, and environmental justice considerations.

ERP No. D–FHW–F54013–IL Rating EO2, Chicago—St. Louis High-Speed Rail Project, Improvement from Chicago to St. Louis to enhance the Passenger Transportation Network, NPDES Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, Cook, Will, Kankakee Grundy, Livington, McLean, Sangemon, Macoupin, Jersey, Madison and St. Louis Counties, IL and St. Louis County, MO.

Summary: EPA believes the RIA Alternative is environmentally preferable and lacks objections to it. The other two alternatives, NSA and IUA, distinctly have a greater impact to the environment. EPA therefore objects to these two alternatives and requests additional information regarding potential impacts to air quality as well as to threatened and endangered species.

ERP No. D–FHW–H40168–MO Rating LO, New Mississippi River Crossing, Relocated I–70 and I–64 Connector, Funding, COE Section 404 and 10 Permits and NPDES Permit, St. Louis County, MO.

Summary: EPA had no objection to the proposed action.

ERP No. D–IBR–K36132–CA Rating EO2, Colusa Basin Drainage District, Developing an Integrated Resource Management Program for the Control of Flooding, Glenn, Colusa and Yolo Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA strongly objected to the reliance on detention dams and reservoirs since they are likely to have significant adverse impacts to scarce high value habitats and the proposed mitigation (1:1 vs 3:1 compensation). In addition it is unlikely that the proposed alternatives will comply with the CWA 404(b)(1) Alternatives Analysis. EPA believes that the flood control program should provide an overall framework for local and regional flood control and include a broad range of nonstructural, managerial, and engineering options. The Program should not preclude opportunities to implement a comprehensive basin-wide solution for