

the contents of the docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, select "search," then key in the docket ID number identified in this document.

What Particular Information Is of Interest to EPA?

Pursuant to section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, EPA specifically solicits comments and information to enable it 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. In particular, EPA is requesting comments from very small businesses (those that employ less than 25) on examples of specific additional efforts that EPA could make to reduce the paperwork burden for very small businesses affected by this collection.

What Should I Consider When Preparing Comments for EPA?

You may find the following suggestions helpful for preparing your comments:

- 1. Explain your views as clearly as possible and provide specific examples.
- 2. Describe any assumptions that you used.
- 3. Provide copies of any technical information and/or data you used that support your views.
- 4. If you estimate potential burden or costs, explain how you arrived at the estimate that you provide.
- 5. Offer alternative ways to improve the collection activity.
- 6. Make sure to submit your comments by the deadline identified under DATES.
- 7. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, be sure to identify the docket ID number assigned to this action in the subject line on the first page of your response. You may also provide the name, date, and **Federal Register** citation.

To What Information Collection Activity or ICR Does This Apply?

In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that EPA is planning to submit the following ICR for renewal: NSPS for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines; EPA ICR Number 2196.03, OMB Control Number 2060-0590; Docket ID Number EPA-HQ-OECA-2008-0899.

Affected entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are facilities with stationary compression internal combustion engines.

Title: NSPS for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines (40 CFR Part 60, Subpart III).

ICR numbers: EPA ICR Number 2196.03, OMB Control Number 2060-0590.

ICR status: This ICR is currently scheduled to expire on August 31, 2009. 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 in title 40 of the CFR, after appearing in the **Federal Register** when approved, are listed in 40 CFR part 9, are displayed either by publication in the **Federal Register** or by other appropriate means, such as on the related collection instrument or form, if applicable. The display of OMB control numbers in certain EPA regulations is consolidated in 40 CFR part 9.

Abstract: The affected entities are subject to the General Provisions of the NSPS at 40 CFR part 60, subpart A and any changes, or additions to the General Provisions specified at 40 CFR part 60, subpart III.

Owners or operators of the affected facilities must make an initial notification and keep records related to engine performance.

Burden Statement: The existing ICR provides a detailed explanation of the Agency's estimate, which is only briefly summarized below. The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average approximately one hour per response.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 152,546.

Frequency of Response: Initially.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 152,733.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: \$242,000, which is comprised of no annualized capital/startup costs and O&M costs of \$242,000.

Are There Changes in the Estimates from the Last Approval?

It is anticipated that the number of respondents will increase to approximately 210,000 for this ICR due to full implementation of the standard so that it covers all affected entities. The existing ICR uses the average number of respondents during the initial period of implementation.

What Is the Next Step in the Process for This ICR?

EPA will consider the comments received and amend the ICR as appropriate. The final ICR package will then be submitted to OMB for review and approval pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.12. At that time, EPA will issue another **Federal Register** notice pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.5(a)(1)(iv) to announce the submission of the ICR to OMB and the opportunity to submit additional comments to OMB. If you have any questions about this ICR or the approval process, please contact the technical person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Dated: December 16, 2008.

Lisa Lund,

Director, Office of Compliance.

[FR Doc. E8-30821 Filed 12-24-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-8588-9]

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 202-564-7146.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 6, 2008 (73 FR 19833).

Draft EISs

EIS No. 20080297, ERP No. D-IBR-K65345-CA, Lake Casitas Resource Management Plan (RMP), Implementation, Cities of Los Angeles and Ventura, Western Ventura County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to environmental resources and impacts from noise. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20080357, ERP No. D-FRC-K05066-CA, Big Creek Hydro Project (FERC Nos. 67, 120, 2085, and 2175) Proposes to Relicenses, Big Creek Nos. 2A, 8 and Eastwood—FERC No. 67; Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2—FERC No. 2175; Mammoth Pool—FERC No. 2085 and Big Creek No. 3 FERC No. 120, Fresno and Madera Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts related to construction activities. EPA requested additional information on the impacts of climate change on the project and the analysis of cumulative impacts. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20080398, ERP No. D-NIH-J81013-MT, Rocky Mountain Laboratories (RML) Master Plan, Implementation, Hamilton, Ravalli County, MT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about air quality, environmental justice and safety/security impacts. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20080409, ERP No. D-COE-J11025-CO, Fort Carson Grow the Army Stationing Decision, Constructing New Facilities to Support Additional Soldiers and their Families, Portions of El Paso, Pueblo and Fremont Counties, CO.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action. Rating LO.

EIS No. 20080432, ERP No. D-COE-G39051-LA, Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet (MRGO), Louisiana, and Lake Borgne Wetland Creation and Shoreline Protection Project, Proposes to Construct Shoreline Protection Features Along the Lake Borgne Shoreline to Restore and Nourish Wetlands, Lake Borgne, LA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about water quality and sediment budget impacts. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20080464, ERP No. DS-AFS-F65062-MN, Echo Trail Area Forest Management Project, Updated Information to Amend to Further Address Water Quality and Watershed Health, Superior National Forest, Lacroix Ranger District and Kawishiwi Ranger District, St. Louis and Lake Counties, MN.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action. Rating LO.

Final EISs

EIS No. 20080351, ERP No. F-SFW-K99039-NV, Coyote Spring Investment Multispecies Conservation Plan, Issuing a 40-year Incidental Take Permit for Five Species, Clark and Lincoln Counties, NV.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about groundwater planning and impacts to biological resources.

EIS No. 20080373, ERP No. F-FHW-E40339-NC, NC 12 Replacement of Herbert C. Bonner Bridge (Bridge No. 11) Revisions and Additions, over Oregon Inlet Construction, Funding, U.S. Coast Guard Permit, Special-Use Permit, Right-of-Way Permit, U.S. Army COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Dare County, NC.

Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns about building additional bridges through a national wildlife refuge and national seashore and the related water quality and migratory bird impacts.

EIS No. 20080452, ERP No. F-GSA-D80032-DC, Department of Homeland Security Headquarters at the St. Elizabeths West Campus, To Consolidate Federal Office Space on a Secure Site, Washington, DC.

Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns about the East Campus resource impacts.

EIS No. 20080454, ERP No. F-OSM-K65321-00, Black Mesa Project, Revisions to the Life-of-Mine Operation and Reclamation for the Kayenta and Black Mesa Surface-Coal Mining Operations, Right-of-Way Grant, Mohave, Navajo, Coconino and Yavapai Counties, AZ and Clark County, NV.

Summary: EPA does not object to this project.

EIS No. 20080457, ERP No. F-APH-A82128-00, PROGRAMMATIC—Use of Genetically Engineered Fruit Fly and Pink Bollworm in APHIS Plant Pest Control Programs, Implementation.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action.

EIS No. 20080458, ERP No. F-COE-K39113-CA, Natomas Levee Improvement Project, Issuing of 408 Permission and 404 Permit, Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, Sutter and Sacramento, CA.

Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns with the residual flood risk to development in a floodplain protected by levees, and indirect and cumulative environmental effects. We recommended the ROD describe how future development will not compromise the flood-risk-reduction achievements of this project or constrain flood protection management; and how future development adheres to, and does not undermine, the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. EPA recommended implementation of the

Natomas Basin flood safety plan prior to additional development, when feasible.

EIS No. 20080463, ERP No. F-FAA-G52000-NM, Spaceport America Commercial Launch Site, Proposal to Develop and Operate, Issuance of License, Sierra County, NM.

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

EIS No. 20080466, ERP No. F-USN-A11081-00, Introduction of the P-8A MMA into the U.S. Navy Fleet, To Provide Facilities and Functions that Support the Homebasing of 12 P-8A Multi-Mission Maritime Aircraft (MMA) Fleet Squadrons (72 Aircraft) and one Fleet Replacement Squadron (FRS), which include the Following Installations: Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL; Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA; Naval Air Station North Island, CA; Marine Corps Base HI and Kaneohe Bay, HI.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action.

EIS No. 20080492, ERP No. F-NPS-F65070-MI, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, General Management Plan and Wilderness Study, Implementation, Benzie and Leelanau Counties, MI.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action. We recommend that the Record of Decision discuss possible negative effects of allowing electric motors on some inland lakes.

EIS No. 20080498, ERP No. F-NOA-K90031-CA, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan, Implementation, Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, CA.

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

EIS No. 20080459, ERP No. FS-COE-K35044-CA, Berth 136–147 [TraPac] Container Terminal Project, Updated Information on the Draft General Conformity Determination, Upgrade Existing Wharf Facilities, Install a Buffer Area between the Terminal and Community, U.S. Army COE Section 10 and 404 Permit, West Basin Portion of the Port of Los Angeles, CA.

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

Dated: December 22, 2008.

Clifford Rader,

Environmental Protection Specialist, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. E8–30909 Filed 12–24–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P