

Period Ends: January 31, 2005,
Contact: Irwin Kessman (212) 668–
2170. Revision of FR Notice Published
on 12/30/2004: CEQ wait period
ending 1/30/05 corrected to 1/31/
2005.

*EIS No. 040601, Final EIS, NRS,
Programmatic EIS—Emergency
Watershed Protection Program,
Improvements and Expansion, To
Preserve Life and Property Threatened
by Disaster-Caused Erosion and
Flooding, U.S. 50 States and
Territories except Coastal Area, Wait
Period Ends: January 31, 2005,
Contact: Victor Cole (202) 690–4575.
Revision of FR Notice published on
12/30/2004: CEQ wait period ending
1/30/2005 corrected to 1/31/2005.*

Dated: January 5, 2005.

Robert W. Hargrove,
*Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office
of Federal Activities.*

[FR Doc. 05–340 Filed 1–6–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-U-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6659–4]

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 02, 2004 (69 FR 17403).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–J65421–00 Rating EC1, Grizzly Bear Conservation for the Greater Yellowstone Area National Forests, Implementation, Amend Six Forest Plans: Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest, Bridger-Teton National Forest, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Custer National Forest, Gallatin National Forest and Shoshone National Forest, MT, WY and ID.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns that the preferred alternative did not include protection measures to reduce conflicts between grizzly bears and other Forest uses and to enhance food security and habitat protections included in other alternatives. EPA believes these

measures would improve water quality, fish and wildlife, and other natural resources and should be considered in the Final EIS.

ERP No. D–AFS–J65423–UT Rating EC2, Reissuance of 10-Year Term Grazing Permits to Continue Authorize Grazing on Eight Cattle Allotments, Permit Reissuance, Fishlake National Forest, Beaver Mountain Tushar Range, Millard, Piute, Garfield, Beaver and Iron Counties, UT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with potential adverse impacts to aquatic resources, water quality, and wildlife habitats as well as soil erosion from continued grazing as proposed in the Draft EIS. The Final EIS should consider greater use of upland areas, include specific guidelines and measures for future adaptive management processes and ensure resources for education, enforcement of permit standards, mitigation and monitoring.

ERP No. D–AFS–J65427–WY Rating EC2, Cottonwood II Vegetation Management Project, Proposal to Implement Vegetation Management in the North and South Cottonwood Creek Drainages, Bridger-Teton National Forest, Big Piney Ranger District, Sublette County, WY.

Summary: EPA has environmental concerns about potential adverse impacts to water quality, aquatic habitat and wildlife resources, soil condition and impacts to fish and wildlife, especially sensitive species. In addition, the Final EIS should include the value of recreation and impacts to recreation related business to assess the full range of potential socio-economic impacts.

ERP No. D–AFS–J65429–CO Rating EC2, Village at Wolf Creek Project, Application for Transportation and Utility Systems and Facilities, Proposed Development and Use of Roads and Utility Corridors Crossing, National Forest System Lands to Access 287.5 Acres of Private Property Land, Mineral County, CO.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with potential adverse impacts to wetlands, water quality and quantity, aquatic habitat, air quality and wildlife, (including lynx and Rio Grande Cut Throat Trout). The Final EIS should include an analysis and quantification of indirect impacts, including impacts from reasonably foreseeable actions and mitigation measures.

ERP No. D–AFS–J65430–MT Rating EC2, McCutten Decision Area, Implementation of Harvest and Associated Activities, Prescribed Burning, and Road Management,

Kootenai National Forest, Rexford Ranger District, Lincoln County, MT.

Summary: EPA supports the project purpose and need, but expressed environmental concerns regarding proposed timber harvests on sensitive soils and potential water quality impacts.

ERP No. DS–AFS–J02027–UT Rating EC2, Table Top Exploratory Oil and Gas Wells, New Information from the Approval 1994 Final EIS, Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Evanston Ranger District, Summit County, UT.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns about the lack of detail given in the mitigation plans to protect the lynx. The Final EIS should include mitigation measures to reduce potential adverse air impacts from flaring during periods with atmospheric inversions.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–AFS–H65021–MO East Fredericktown Project, To Restore Shortleaf Pine, Improve Forest Health, Treat Affected Stands and Recover Valuable Timber Products, Mark Twain National Forest, Potosi/Fredericktown Ranger District, Bollinger, Madison, St. Francois and Ste. Genevieve Counties, MO.

Summary: The Final EIS adequately addressed EPA's issues raised in the comments on the Draft EIS.

ERP No. F–AFS–J65415–MT Robert-Wedge Post-Fire Project, Salvage Trees and Rehabilitate Lands, Flathead National Forest, Glacier View Ranger District, Flathead County, MT.

Summary: EPA is concerned that logging in areas of high burn severity may result in detrimental soil and water quality effects, and increased erosion and sediment production and supports the use of less damaging logging techniques. EPA also expressed environmental concerns regarding road management activities.

ERP No. F–AFS–J65420–SD Southeast Geographic Area Rangeland Management on National Forest System Lands of the Buffalo Gap National Grassland, To Implement Best Management Grazing Practices, Buffalo Gap National Grassland, Falls River Ranger District, Fall River County, SD.

Summary: EPA's main concerns relate to continuing adverse impacts from livestock grazing to: (1) Streams, riparian zones, and wetlands; (2) fecal coliform and other bacteria, sediment, and other impacts that are impairing beneficial uses for warmwater fish and other aquatic life; and (3) the need for better riparian protections to manage livestock activities that cause adverse impacts to fish and other aquatic life and their habitats.

ERP No. F-AFS-J65422-MT West Side Reservoir Post-Fire Project, Proposed Implementation of Timber Salvage and Access Management Treatments, Flathead National Forest, Hungry Horse and Spotted Bear Ranger Districts, Flathead County, MT.

Summary: EPA supports less damaging logging methods proposed and project modifications to reduce potential adverse effects. However, EPA is still concerned that post-fire logging may impact soils, water quality, and wildlife habitat (particularly habitat of the threatened grizzly bear).

ERP No. F-AFS-L65456-AK Resurrection Creek Stream and Riparian Restoration Project, Proposes to Accelerate the Recovery of Riparian Areas, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Chugach National Forest, Seward Ranger District, Kenai Peninsula Borough, AK.

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

ERP No. F-AFS-L65457-OR Crooked River National Grassland Vegetation Management/Grazing, Vegetation Treatments and Grazing Disposition, Ochoco National Forest, Jefferson County, OR.

Summary: EPA expressed lack of objections and supports the USFS efforts to work with watershed councils and ODEQ to develop Water Quality Management Plans for the streams within the Grasslands which do not meet ambient water quality standards.

Dated: January 4, 2005.

Robert W. Hargrove,
Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 05-345 Filed 1-6-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPP-2005-0002; FRL-7694-3]

Cyprodinil; Notice of Filing a Pesticide Petition to Establish a Tolerance for a Certain Pesticide Chemical in or on Food

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the initial filing of a pesticide petition proposing the establishment of regulations for residues of a certain pesticide chemical in or on various food commodities.

DATES: Comments, identified by docket identification (ID) number [OPP-2005-0002, must be received on or before February 7, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted electronically, by mail, or through hand delivery/courier. Follow the detailed instructions as provided in Unit I. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sidney C. Jackson, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; telephone number: (703) 305-7610; e-mail address: jackson.sidney@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected entities may include, but are not limited to:

- Crop production (NAICS 111)
- Animal production (NAICS 112)
- Food manufacturing (NAICS 311)
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS 32532)

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in this unit could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether this action might apply to certain entities. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

B. How Can I Get Copies of this Document and Other Related Information?

1. *Docket.* EPA has established an official public docket for this action under docket ID number OPP-2005-0002. The official public docket consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, any public comments received, and other information related to this action. Although a part of the official docket, the public docket does not include Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. The official public docket is the collection of materials that is available for public viewing at the Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1801 S. Bell St., Arlington, VA. This docket facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday,

excluding legal holidays. The docket telephone number is (703) 305-5805.

2. *Electronic access.* You may access this **Federal Register** document electronically through the EPA Internet under the “**Federal Register**” listings at <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/>.

An electronic version of the public docket is available through EPA’s electronic public docket and comment system, EPA Dockets. You may use EPA Dockets at <http://www.epa.gov/edocket/> to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the docket facility identified in Unit I.B.1. Once in the system, select “search,” then key in the appropriate docket ID number.

Certain types of information will not be placed in the EPA Dockets. Information claimed as CBI and other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute, which is not included in the official public docket, will not be available for public viewing in EPA’s electronic public docket. EPA’s policy is that copyrighted material will not be placed in EPA’s electronic public docket but will be available only in printed, paper form in the official public docket. To the extent feasible, publicly available docket materials will be made available in EPA’s electronic public docket. When a document is selected from the index list in EPA Dockets, the system will identify whether the document is available for viewing in EPA’s electronic public docket. Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the docket facility identified in Unit I.B. EPA intends to work towards providing electronic access to all of the publicly available docket materials through EPA’s electronic public docket.

For public commenters, it is important to note that EPA’s policy is that public comments, whether submitted electronically or in paper, will be made available for public viewing in EPA’s electronic public docket as EPA receives them and without change, unless the comment contains copyrighted material, CBI, or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. When EPA identifies a comment containing copyrighted material, EPA will provide a reference to that material in the version of the comment that is placed in EPA’s electronic public docket. The