

Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, (6609J), Washington, D.C. 20460.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. John Guevin by phone at (202) 564-9055 or by e-mail at [guevin.john@epa.gov](mailto:guevin.john@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Affected entities:* Entities potentially affected by this action are all public and private schools operating in the United States during the school year immediately preceding the year in which the survey is conducted.

*Title:* IAQ Practices in Schools Survey (EPA ICR No. 1885.01). This is a new collection.

*Abstract:* As part of its authorization under Title IV of SARA, 1986, the Indoor Environments Division (IED) of EPA's Office of Radiation and Indoor Air has been working to promote more effective approaches for preventing, identifying, and solving indoor air quality (IAQ) problems in schools and has developed low-cost guidance entitled IAQ Tools for Schools for that purpose.

The IAQ Practices in Schools Survey will allow EPA to gain information regarding the number of schools that have implemented sound IAQ-management practices, such as those activities recommended in its guidance. These data are essential for measuring the effectiveness of EPA's outreach efforts against the Agency's established GPRA goal. EPA is working towards achieving the implementation of sound IAQ practices in 15 percent, or 16,650, of the nation's public and private schools by 2005. The IAQ Practices in Schools Survey is voluntary.

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 annual public reporting and record keeping burden for this collection of information to be 1.3 hours per mail response and 0.8 hours per telephone 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; 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.

This survey effort is expected to cost approximately \$27.60 per mail response and \$16.95 per telephone response. Respondents will incur no capital or start-up costs, and the only operation and maintenance component of the survey will be the cost to photocopy the survey once completed (if desired).

Dated: October 6, 2000.

**Mary T. Smith,**

*Director, Indoor Environments Division.*

[FR Doc. 00-27033 Filed 10-19-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-U**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[FRL-6885-3]

**Adequacy Status of Submitted State Implementation Plans (SIP) for Transportation Conformity Purposes: Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) and Beaumont-Port Arthur (BPA) Attainment Demonstration SIPs for Ozone**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of adequacy determination.

**SUMMARY:** In this notice, the EPA is announcing that the motor vehicle emissions budgets contained in the

submitted DFW and BPA Attainment Demonstration State Implementation Plans (SIP) for ozone are adequate for transportation conformity purposes. As a result of this determination, the budgets from the submitted attainment SIPs must be used for transportation conformity determinations in the DFW and BPA areas. The EPA received no public comments.

**DATES:** These budgets are effective November 6, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. J. Behnam, P.E., The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202; telephone (214) 665-7247.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. The EPA's conformity rule, 40 CFR part 93, requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to SIPs and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the national ambient air quality standards. The criteria by which EPA determines whether a SIP's motor vehicle emission budgets are adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). An adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review, and it should not be used to prejudge EPA's ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find a budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved.

On March 2, 1999, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit issued its opinion in *Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 167 F.3d 641 (D.C. Cir. 1999), and ruled that budgets contained in submitted SIPs cannot be used for conformity determinations unless EPA has affirmatively found the conformity budget adequate. We have described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in the policy guidance dated May 14, 1999, and titled *Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision*. You may obtain a copy of this guidance from EPA's conformity web site: <http://www.epa.gov/oms/traq> (once there, click on "conformity" and then scroll down) or by contacting us at the address above.

By this notice, we are simply announcing the DFW and BPA adequacy determinations that we have already made. The Governor of Texas

submitted the DFW Attainment Demonstration SIP on April 25, 2000. The Attainment SIP contained the 2007 motor vehicle emissions budgets for VOC (107.60 tons/day) and NO<sub>x</sub> (164.30 tons/day) for the DFW ozone nonattainment area. On May 9, 2000, the availability of those budgets was posted on EPA's web site for the purpose of soliciting public comments. The public comment period closed on June 8, 2000, and the EPA did not receive any comments. Also, the Governor submitted additional information on the BPA Attainment Demonstration SIP on April 25, 2000, to supplement the November 15, 1999, initial submission. The Attainment SIP contained the 2007 motor vehicle emissions budgets for VOC (17.22 tons/day) and NO<sub>x</sub> (29.94 tons/day) for the BPA ozone nonattainment area. On August 1, 2000, the availability of those budgets was posted on EPA's web site for the purpose of soliciting public comments. The public comment period closed on August 31, 2000, and the EPA did not receive any comments. After the public comment process, we sent a letter, dated September 6, 2000, to the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission stating that these budgets are adequate and they must be used for transportation conformity determinations.

Therefore, the budgets contained in the submitted DFW and BPA Attainment SIPs as cited in this notice must be used for transportation conformity by the Metropolitan Planning Organizations in the DFW and BPA areas.

Dated: September 29, 2000.

**Myron M. Knudson,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.*

[FR Doc. 00-27035 Filed 10-19-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6611-9]

### 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-AFS-F65027-MN* Rating LO, Little East Creek Fuel Reduction Project, Plan to Grant Access Across Federal Land to Non-Federal Landowners, Implementation, LaCroix Ranger District, Superior National Forest, Saint Louis County, MN.

*Summary:* EPA has no objections to the project.

*ERP No. D-AFS-K65228-CA* Rating EC2, Airport Forest Health Project, Forest Health Improvements through Reduction of Fuel Loads and Fire Hazards and Wildlife Habitat Improvements Implementation, Pacific Ranger District, El Dorado National Forest, El Dorado and Placer Counties, CA.

*Summary:* EPA expressed concerns regarding purpose and need, the range of alternatives analyzed, and lack of appropriate mitigation for 2.2 miles of new road construction. EPA also recommended consideration of land tenure adjustments to block ownership, and disclosure of potential conflicts with standards and guidelines being developed as part of the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment process.

*ERP No. D-AFS-L65363-OR* Rating EC2, Anthony Lakes Mountain Resort Master Development Plan, Upgrading and Additional Development, Approval, Baker Ranger District, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, Grant, Union and Baker Counties, OR.

*Summary:* EPA expressed concerns with the potential impacts associated from the addition of snowmobile rentals to the Master Development Plan (MDP). The final EIS should disclose additional information regarding how the number of allowable rentals will be defined in both the MDP and the Special Use Permit.

*ERP No. D-AFS-L65364-ID* Rating EC2, South Fourth of July Ecosystem Restoration Project, Implementation, Salmon-Cobalt Ranger District, Salmon-Challis National Forest, Lemhi County, ID.

*Summary:* EPA expressed concerns about water quality, air quality and cumulative effects and requested additional information that would address our concerns.

*ERP No. D-BOP-K80042-CA* Rating EC2, Lompoc United States Penitentiary (UPS) Construction and Operation of a New High-Security Facility and Ancillary Structures on One of Three Sites located in the City of Lompoc, Funding, Santa Barbara County, CA.

*Summary:* EPA expressed concerns regarding lack of information specific to

the facility location and the prison industry component of the proposed project. EPA also recommended that all wetlands be avoided on the preferred project site.

*ERP No. D-IBR-K39062-00* Rating EC2, Colorado River Interim Surplus Criteria, To Determine Water Surplus for use within the States of Arizona, California and Nevada (from 2001 through 2015), Colorado River Basin, AZ, CA and NV.

*Summary:* EPA expressed concerns with the minimal evaluation of indirect impacts from use and storage of surplus water and of mitigation measures for direct, indirect, and cumulative effects. The surplus determination should also include more specific requirements for efficient and beneficial use of the declared surplus.

#### Final EISs

*ERP No. F-AFS-J65309-UT* Trout Slope East Timber Project, Timber Harvest and Associated Activities, Implementation, Vernal Ranger District, Ashley National Forest, Uintah County, UT.

*Summary:* EPA's comments and concerns with the draft EIS were adequately addressed, therefore, EPA has no objections with the proposed action.

*ERP No. F-AFS-L65348-ID* Idaho Panhandle National Forests, Small Sales, Harvesting Dead and Damaged Timber, Coeur d'Alene River Range District, Kootenai and Shoshone Counties, ID.

*Summary:* EPA's previous concerns were addressed, therefore, EPA has no objection to the action as proposed.

*ERP No. F-COE-E39049-FL* Improving the Regulatory Process in Southwest Florida for the Review of Applications for the Fill of Wetlands (US Army COE Section 404 Permit), Lee and Collier Counties, FL.

*Summary:* EPA stated with some substantive changes, the proposed permit review process (assessing the direct, indirect/induced, and cumulative impact(s) on wetland and related systems) can provide effective wetland regulation in southwest Florida.

*ERP No. F-FTA-C53004-NY* 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 continues to lack objections to the proposed action since no significant new issues were raised since the draft EIS.

*ERP No. F-USN-C11016-NY* Brooklyn Naval Station Disposal and