ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6884–8]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Reformulated Gasoline and Conventional Gasoline

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): Reformulated Gasoline and Conventional Gasoline, (EPA ICR No. 1591.13, OMB Control No. 2060–0277, expiration date: 12–31–00). Before submitting the 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 12, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Transportation and Regional Programs Division, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Office of Air and Radiation, Mail Code 6406J, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460. A paper or electronic copy of the draft ICR may be obtained without charge by contacting the person listed below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James W. Caldwell, (202) 564–9303, fax: (202) 565–2085, caldwell.jim@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Affected entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are those which produce, import, or distribute gasoline.

Title: Reformulated Gasoline and Conventional Gasoline: Requirements for Refiners, Oxygenate Blenders, and Importers of Gasoline; Requirements for Parties in the Gasoline Distribution Network (40 CFR part 80—subparts D, E and F), EPA ICR No. 1591.13, OMB Control No. 2060–0277, expiration date: 12–31–00.

Abstract: Gasoline combustion is the major source of air pollution in most urban areas. The Clean Air Act (Act) requires that gasoline dispensed in certain areas with severe air quality problems be reformulated to reduce toxic and ozone-forming (smog) emissions. The Act also requires that in the process of producing reformulated gasoline (RFG), dirty components removed in the reformulation process not be ''dumped'' into the remainder of the country's gasoline, known as conventional gasoline (CG). The EPA promulgated regulations at 40 CFR part 80 establishing standards for RFG and CG, as specified in the Act, and establishing mandatory reporting and recordkeeping requirements for demonstrating compliance and as an aid to enforcement. The primary requirements are to test each batch of gasoline for various properties, report the results to EPA, and demonstrate compliance with the standards on an annual basis. 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 EPA would like to 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 of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

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

(iv) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, 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: EPA estimates the respondent population at 75 RFG refineries, 25 RFG import facilities, 25 RFG oxygenate blenders, 225 CG refineries, 50 CG import facilities, 250 pipelines and terminals, 500 truckers, 19 independent laboratories, 20 auditors, and the RFG Survey Association, Inc. The typical RFG or CG respondent will have around 100 to 130 reports per year, depending primarily on the number of batches of gasoline involved. The total number of reports is estimated at 53,170 and the total burden at 101,585 hours. While this gives an average burden per report of about two hours, about 95% of the reports have an estimated burden of one hour. At $60 per hour, the labor cost is about $6 million. Most start-up costs were incurred at the start of the program in 1995. However, there is an estimated annualized capital cost for analysis equipment of $4.8 million. Annual operating and maintenance costs are estimated at about $5 million, and annual purchase of services costs are estimated at about $13 million. 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.

Dated: October 4, 2000.

Lori Stewart,

Acting Director, Transportation and Regional Programs Division.

[FR Doc. 00–26354 Filed 10–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6611–6]

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 October 02, 2000 Through October 06, 2000

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 000345, FINAL EIS, COE, DE, Fenwick Island Feasibility Study, Storm Damage Reduction, Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Protective Berm and Dune Construction, Community of Fenwick Island, Sussex County, DE, Due: November 13, 2000, Contact: Steve Allen (215) 656–6555.

EIS No. 000346, FINAL EIS, NPS, CA, Anacapa Island Restoration Project, Implementation, Channel Islands National Park, Ventura County, CA, Due: November 13, 2000, Contact: Alan Schmierer (415) 427–1441.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 000338, DRAFT EIS, STB, SD, WY, MN, Powder River Basin Expansion Project, Construction of

New Rail Facilities, Finance Docket No. 33407 Dakota, Minnesota and Eastern Railroad, SD, WY and MN, Due: January 05, 2001, Contact: Victoria Rutson (202) 565–1545. Revision of FR notice published on 10/06/2000: CEQ Comment Date corrected from 11/20/2000 to 01/05/2001.

Dated: October 10, 2000.

Joseph C. Montgomery,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 00–26386 Filed 10–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6611–7]

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) 260–5076. 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–USN–D11030–VA Rating EC2, Marine Corps Heritage Center (MCHC) Complex, Construction and Operation at Marine Corps Base (MCB) Quantico, VA.

Summary: EPA expressed concern due to the loss of valuable forested habitat. EPA recommended reducing the area of deforestation by consolidating MCHC functions into multi-story buildings and creating underground and/or raised parking structures as well as reducing to a minimum the size of the area needed for demonstration operations.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–FHW–B40090–ME Augusta River Crossing Study, To Reduce Traffic Deficiencies within the Transportation System Serving the City of Augusta, Funding, Kennebec River, Kennebec County, ME.

Summary: A number of the concerns regarding analysis of alternatives and potential impacts EPA raised in its review of the draft EIS remain unaddressed in the final EIS.

ERP No. F–FHW–D40306–WV King Coal Highway Project Construction, from the vicinity of Williamson to the vicinity of Bluefield, COE Section 404 Permit, Mingo, McDowell Mercer, and Wyoming Counties, WV.

Summary: EPA maintains its concerns regarding the level of information provided in assessing the impacts to streams, wetlands, and community resources for the proposed 96 mile transportation corridor.

ERP No. F–FHW–J40145–UT Legacy Parkway Project, Construction from I–215 at 2100 North in Salt Lake City to I–15 and US 89 near Farmington, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, Salt Lake and Davis Counties, UT.

Summary: EPA continues to have objections to the proposed action. EPA has determined that the least damaging alternative has not been selected, and the proposed Legacy Nature Preserve does not fully offset the wetland impacts. EPA is also concerned with the alternative selection process used in the FEIS, the permanence of the proposed Legacy Preserve, the accuracy and reproducibility of the traffic demand model, and the impacts of connected and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

Adoption—Woodrow Wilson Bridge Replacement, I–95/I–495 From West of Telegraph Road to East of MD Routes 210, City of Alexandria and Fairfax County, VA; Prince George's County, MD and DC.

Summary: EPA's key concerns pertain to time of year restrictions to protect fishery resources, upland disposal of dredged material, and completion of a comprehensive compensatory mitigation package.

ERP No. FS–COE–E36167–FL Central and Southern Florida Project for Flood Control and Other Purposes, Everglades National Park Modified Water Deliveries, New Information concerning Flood Mitigation to the 8.5 Square Mile Area (SMA), Implementation, South Miami, Dade County, FL.

Summary: EPA agreed that Alternative 6D (modified) reasonably maximized ecosystem restoration benefits when compared to the costs and social impacts.

Dated: October 10, 2000.

Joseph C. Montgomery,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 00–26387 Filed 10–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6884–7]

Transfer and Cross-Collateralization of Clean Water State Revolving Funds and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Policy statement.

SUMMARY: Enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Amendments of 1996 and the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act of Fiscal Year 1999, (Appropriations Act) provide flexibility to States for both their drinking water and wastewater needs. The SDWA Amendments established the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) and also contain a provision authorizing States to transfer funds between the DWSRF and the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF). Congress also created additional flexibility by authorizing a form of cross-collateralization in the Appropriations Act. With proper planning, priority setting, and public disclosure, these two provisions can assist the States in maximizing their infrastructure funding programs by increasing the availability of funds where they are most needed, enhancing bond ratings, and lowering borrowing costs without increasing risks.

Since there are similarities between the two SRF programs, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) intends to administer the two programs in a similar manner in regard to transfers and cross-collateralization. Requirements regarding transfer and cross-collateralization of funds are contained in EPA's Interim Final Rule, Drinking Water State Revolving Funds (see 65 FR 48286). This policy establishes EPA policy regarding the use of these two provisions in funding DWSRF and CWSRF projects. It identifies the process a State must undergo to gain EPA approval for incorporating transfers and/or cross-collateralization into its SRF program.

DATES: This policy statement is effective October 13, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical inquiries, contact Sheila Platt, State Revolving Fund Branch, Municipal Support Division, Office of Wastewater Management (MC–0064204), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,