

to verify some limited vehicle information. Three of those who return the card are called and asked about a half dozen questions concerning vehicle condition, and operation and maintenance. Additional groups of potential participants may be contacted until a sufficient number of vehicles has been obtained. Owners verify the survey information when they deliver their vehicles to EPA, voluntarily provide maintenance records for copying, and receive a loaner car or a cash incentive.

Procurement and testing are different for the heavy-duty and nonroad in-use testing program. All testing is done by installing "Rover" portable emissions monitoring devices on the vehicle or engine during a period of operation. Heavy-duty trucks, those commonly referred to as over $\frac{3}{4}$ ton capacity, are usually employed commercially; typically they are part of a fleet of identical (or very similar) vehicles. Consequently, EPA employs a slightly different method to obtain them. Potential owners/lessees can be found in registrations lists; engine manufacturers will also supply identities of their customers. In addition, EPA has a network of entities who have shown a willingness to participate over the years. Once a potential source is identified, EPA will make a brief telephone call to the fleet manager to ascertain if they wish to participate. If the response is positive, EPA's contractors will frequently visit the fleet to install the testing instruments at the company's service facility or government garage. Otherwise, the lessee will be within driving distance of the testing grounds and the devices will be installed there. The procedure for nonroad vehicles and engines (e.g., farm tractors, compressors) is similar; in some cases the vehicle or engine may be rented for the day. Therefore, EPA makes far fewer inquiries than with individual owners of light vehicles in the process of procuring an estimated 126 vehicles and engines a year for this program. As with the light-duty component, all participation is strictly voluntary.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.15 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; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements which have subsequently changed; 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.

The ICR Supporting Statement provides a detailed explanation of the Agency's estimate, which is only briefly summarized here:

Estimated total number of potential respondents: Approximately 4,411

owners/lessees receive EPA's solicitations to participate and approximately 336 do participate.

Frequency of response: On Occasion.

Estimated total average number of responses for each respondent: One.

Estimated total annual burden hours: 658.

Estimated total annual costs: \$49,320. This includes an estimated burden cost of \$49,320 and an estimated cost of \$0 for capital investment or maintenance and operational costs.

Are There Changes in the Estimates From the Last Approval?

There is an increase of 58 hours in the total estimated respondent burden compared with that identified in the ICR currently approved by OMB. This increase reflects EPA's updating of burden estimates based upon historical information on the scope of EPA's in-use testing programs and the number of vehicles and engines tested. **Note:** This ICR was previously titled, "Investigation into Possible Noncompliance of Motor Vehicles".

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: April 16, 2007.

Margo Tsirigotis Oge,
Director, Office of Transportation and Air Quality.

[FR Doc. E7-7542 Filed 4-19-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6686-2]

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 the **Federal Register** dated April 6, 2007 (72 FR 17156).

Draft EISs

EIS No. 20060469, ERP No. D-FHW-D40338-00, U.S. 301 Project Development, Transportation Improvements from MD State Line to DE-1, South of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, New Castle County, DE.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about wetland impacts and requested additional wetlands mitigation.

Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070014, ERP No. D-FHW-F40439-WI, WI-15 Expansion, from New London to Greenville, Funding, U.S. Army COE 404 Permit, Outagamie County, WI.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about wetland and water quality impacts, air toxics, and noise exposure.

Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070030, ERP No. D-IBR-J28022-00, Red River Valley Water Supply Project, Development and Delivery of a Bulk Water Supply to meet Long-Term Water Needs of the Red River Valley, Implementation, ND and MN.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about potential impacts of Missouri River Basin depletion and ecological impacts from potential introduction of invasive species. EPA provided recommendations for biota transfer water treatment, adaptive management, and drought contingency measures.

Rating EC1.

EIS No. 20070050, ERP No. D-FRC-G02015-00, East Texas to Mississippi Expansion Project, Construction and Operation of 243.3 miles Natural Gas Pipeline to Transport Natural Gas

from Production Fields in eastern Texas to Markets in the Gulf Coast, Midwestern, Northeastern and Southeastern United States.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action, but suggests updating the air quality impact analysis. Rating LO.

EIS No. 20070052, ERP No. D-NPS-D61059-PA, Valley Forge National Historical Park, General Management Plan, Implementation, King of Prussia, PA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about potential adverse impacts of the proposed actions to water quality and wetlands. The Final EIS should detail how the two proposed bridges, removal of dams, potential for mobilization of contaminants in sediments behind the dam, increased stormwater flow and changing forested habitat to meadow will impact already impaired waters and wildlife habitat. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070056, ERP No. D-FHW-G40193-LA, I-49 South Project, from Raceland to the Westbank Expressway Route U.S. 90, Funding, Coast Guard Bridge Permit, U.S. Army COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Jefferson, Lafourche, and St. Charles Parishes, LA.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action, but requests clarification on some air quality issues. Rating LO.

EIS No. 20070070, ERP No. DA-AFS-K65283-CA, Empire Vegetation Management Project, Supplemental Information to Clarify Cumulative Effects Analysis, Mount Hough Ranger District, Plumas National Forest, Plumas County, CA.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action, but requests clarification of monitoring and adaptive management issues.

Rating LO.

EIS No. 20060236, ERP No. DS-AFS-L65383-ID, Hidden Cedar Project, Updated Information, Manage Vegetation Conditions and the Transportation System, Idaho Panhandle National Forests, St. Joe Ranger District, Benewah, Latah and Shoshone Counties, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the potential adverse of water quality impacts due to the proposed increase in road miles which would occur in watersheds that are already impaired from existing high road densities, as well as past mining and grazing activities.

Rating EC2.

Final EISs

EIS No. 20070024, ERP No. F-AFS-D65033-PA, West Branch of Tionesta Project, Multiple Resource Management, Implementation Bradford Ranger District, Allegheny National Forest, Warren County, PA.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed project.

EIS No. 20070074, ERP No. F-SFW-K65493-CA, East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan, Implementation, Incidental Take Permit, Cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley and Pittsburg, Contra Costa County, CA.

Summary: EPA's previous concerns have been addressed; therefore, EPA does not object to the proposed action.

EIS No. 20070076, ERP No. F-AFS-F65064-WI, Boulder Project, Timber Harvesting, Vegetation and Road Management, U.S. Army COE Section 404 Permit, Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest, Lakewood-Laona Ranger District, Oconto and Langlade Counties, WI.

Summary: While the final EIS addressed EPA's request for additional analysis of cumulative impacts, EPA continues to have environmental concerns about the lack of specific habitat information.

EIS No. 20070081, ERP No. F-JUS-G81013-TX, Laredo Detention Facility, Proposed Contractor-Owned/ Contractor-Operated Detention Facility, Implementation, Webb County, TX.

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

EIS No. 20070082, ERP No. F-GSA-D81037-VA, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Central Records Complex, Alternative 4—Sempeles Site, Winchester, Frederick County, VA.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action.

EIS No. 20070090, ERP No. F-AFS-J65462-00, Dakota Prairie Grasslands Noxious Weed Management Project, Implementation, Billings, Slope, Golden Valley, Sioux, Grant, McHenry, Ransom and Richland Counties, ND and Corson, Perkins, and Ziebach Counties, SD.

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

Dated: April 17, 2007.

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

[FR Doc. E7-7547 Filed 4-19-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6686-1]

Environmental Impacts Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564-7167 or <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/>.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements filed 04/09/2007 through 04/13/2007 pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 20070144, Final EIS, AFS, CA, Brown Project, Proposal to Improve Forest Health by Reducing Overcrowded Forest Stand Conditions, Trinity River Management Unit, Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Weaverville Ranger District, Trinity County, CA, Wait Period Ends: 05/21/2007, Contact: Joyce Andersen 530-623-2121.

EIS No. 20070145, Draft Supplement, AFS, UT, Ogden Ranger District Travel Plan Revision, To Present Additional Analysis for Six Alternatives, Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Ogden Ranger District, Box Elder, Cache, Morgan, Weber and Rich Counties, UT, Comment Period Ends: 06/04/2007, Contact: Rick Vallejos 801-625-5112.

EIS No. 20070146, Final EIS, COE, CA, ADOPTION—Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Project, Addressing Hydrologic, Seismic, Static, and Flood Management Issues, Sacramento, El Dorado and Placer Counties, CA, Wait Period Ends: 05/21/2007, Contact: Jane Rinck 916-557-6715.

EIS No. 20070147, Draft EIS, AFS, MT, Trapper Bunk House Land Stewardship Project, Reduce Risk from Stand-Replacing and Uncontrollable Fires, Improve Resiliency and Provide Forest Products, Fuel Reduction Research and Watershed Improvement, Bitterroot National Forest, Darby Ranger District, Ravalli County, MT, Comment Period Ends: 06/04/2007, Contact: Chuck Oliver 406-821-3913.

EIS No. 20070148, Final EIS, FHW, NC, US 64 Corridor Project, Transportation Improvements in the Vicinity of the City of Asheboro and Improved Access to the NC Zoological Park, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Project No. R-2536, Randolph County, NC, Wait Period Ends: 05/21/2007, Contact: John F. Sullivan 919-856-4346.

EIS No. 20070149, Draft EIS, FRC, 00, Southeast Expansion Project,