- 7. Make sure to submit your comments by the deadline identified under **DATES**.
- 8. 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.

III. What Information Collection Activity or ICR Does this Action Apply to?

Affected entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are companies that manufacture or import chemical substances, mixtures, or categories.

Title: TSCA Section 8(a) Preliminary Assessment Information Rule (PAIR). ICR numbers: EPA ICR No. 0586.11, OMB Control No. 2070–0054.

ICR status: This ICR is currently scheduled to expire on May 31, 2008. 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

Abstract: Section 8(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) authorizes EPA to promulgate rules under which manufacturers, importers, and processors of chemical substances and mixtures must maintain records and submit reports to EPA. EPA has promulgated PAIR under TSCA section 8(a). EPA uses PAIR to collect information to identify, assess, and manage human health and environmental risks from chemical substances, mixtures, and categories. PAIR requires chemical manufacturers and importers to complete a standardized reporting form to help evaluate the potential for adverse human health and environmental effects caused by the manufacture or importation of identified chemical substances, mixtures, or categories. Chemicals identified by EPA or any other Federal Agency, for which a justifiable information need for production, use, or exposure-related data can be satisfied by the use of the PAIR are proper subjects for TSCA section 8(a) PAIR rulemaking. In most instances the information that EPA receives from a PAIR report is sufficient

to satisfy the information need in question. This information collection addresses the reporting and recordkeeping requirements associated with TSCA section 8(a).

Responses to the collection of information are mandatory (see 40 CFR parts 712, 766, and 792). Respondents may claim all or part of a document confidential. EPA will disclose information that is covered by a claim of confidentiality only to the extent permitted by, and in accordance with, the procedures in TSCA section 14 and 40 CFR part 2.

Burden statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 28.9 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 provides a detailed explanation of this estimate, which is only briefly summarized here:

Estimated total number of potential respondents: 26.

Frequency of response: On occasion. Estimated total average number of responses for each respondent: 2.1.

Estimated total annual burden hours: 1,568 hours.

Estimated total annual costs: \$89,593. This includes an estimated burden cost of \$89,593 and an estimated cost of \$0 for capital investment or maintenance and operational costs.

IV. Are There Changes in the Estimates from the Last Approval?

There is an increase of 988 hours in the total estimated respondent burden compared with that identified in the ICR currently approved by OMB. This increase reflects EPA's experience with the assumed number of PAIR reports submitted annually, based on the past five fiscal years (2003–2007) of PAIR reporting data. The change is an adjustment.

V. 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. 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.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: December 14, 2007.

James Jones,

Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. E7–24842 Filed 12–20–07; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6694-3]

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 6, 2007 (72 FR 17156).

Draft EISs

EIS No. 20070385, ERP No. D-FHW-C40173–00, Peace Bridge Expansion Project, Capacity Improvements to the Peace Bridge, Plazas and Connecting Roadways, U.S. Coast Guard Bridge Permit, U.S. Army COE Section 10 and 404 Permits. City of Buffalo, Erie County, NY and Town of Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada. Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about air impacts, particularly during the construction phase of the project, as well as impacts to aquatic habitat. EPA also recommends additional cumulative impacts analyses be done. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070409, ERP No. D-AFS-J65392-MT, Beartooth Ranger District Travel Management Planning, Proposing to Designate Routes for Public Motorized Use, and Change Management of Pack and Saddle Stock on Certain Trail, Beartooth Ranger District, Custer National Forest, Carbon, Stillwater, Sweet Grass, and Park Counties, MT. Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to water quality, fisheries, wildlife and other resources, and recommended that the preferred alternative include modifications to reduce roads in high hazard areas, avoid adding new roads and road decommissioning to reduce risks to water quality and fisheries. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070430, ERP No. D–FHW– E40818–NC, NC–119 Relocation Project, Transportation Improvement from the I–185/40 Interchange Southwest of Mebane to Existing NC–119 south of NC–1918 (Mrs White Lane) Mebane, Right-of-Way Acquisition, Alamance County, NC. Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to streams, a historic property, a water supply area, and possible residential relocations. Rating EC1.

EIS No. 20070451, ERP No. D-AFS-J65395-UT, Indian Springs Road Realignment, Reducing Adverse Impacts to Watershed and Fisheries, U.S. Army COE Section 404 Permit, Uinta National Forest, Heber Ranger District, Wasatch County, UT. Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to the roadless area, and requested that other alternatives that would avoid the roadless area be investigated. If an alternative is not available, EPA requested mitigation to offset impacts to the roadless area. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070368, ERP No. DS-BLM-K67052-NV, Newmont Gold Mining, South Operations Area Project Amendment, Updated Information on the Cumulative Effects Analyses, Operation and Expansion, Plan of Operations, Elko and Eureka Counties, NV. Summary: EPA continues to have environmental objections to the project because of its potential significant adverse impacts to water quality and the lack of sufficient measures to ensure against acid rock drainage. We recommend the final SEIS provide additional information regarding mine geochemistry, measures to prevent acid drainage, mitigation for potential

impacts to pit lake water quality, water quality monitoring, mercury emissions and controls, and financial assurance. Rating EO2.

EIS No. 20070369, ERP No. DS-BLM-K67056-NV, Leeville Mining Project, Propose to Develop and Operate an Underground Mine and Ancillary Facilities including Dewatering Operation, Updated Information on the Cumulative Effects Analyses, Plan-of-Operations/Right-of-Way Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, Elko and Eureka Counties, NV. Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns because of the project's potential significant adverse impacts to water quality and the lack of sufficient measures to ensure against acid rock drainage. We recommend the final SEIS provide additional information regarding mine geochemistry, measures to prevent acid drainage, mercury emissions and controls, and financial assurance. Rating EC2.

Final EISs

EIS No. 20070446, ERP No. F–FHW– F40438–IN, I–69 Evansville to Indianapolis Project, I–69 Tier 2 Section 1: Evansville to Oakland City, from 1–64 to IN–64, Preferred Alternative is 4, Gibson and Warrick Counties, IN. Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed project.

EIS No. 20070448, ERP No. F–USA– A15000–00, PROGRAMMATIC— Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment, Implementation, Nationwide. *Summary:* EPA does not object to the proposed project.

EIS No. 20070475, ERP No. F–FHW– H40191–KS, ADOPTION—Kansas Highway 10 (commonly known as South Lawrence Trafficway) Relocation, Issuance or Denial of Section 404 Permit Request, Lawrence City, Douglas County, KS. Summary: No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

Dated: December 18, 2007.

Robert W. Hargrove,

 $\label{linear_problem} \textit{Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office} \\ \textit{of Federal Activities.}$

[FR Doc. E7–24843 Filed 12–20–07; 8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6694-2]

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 12/10/2007 Through 12/14/2007 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 20070522, Final EIS, IBR, CA, Lower Yuba River Accord, Proposal to Resolve Instream Flow Issues Associated with Operation, Yuba River, Yuba County, CA, Wait Period Ends: 01/22/2008, Contact: Tim Rust 916–978–5516

EIS No. 20070523, Draft EIS, NRC, NC, Generic—License Renewal of Nuclear Plants (GEIS) Regarding Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Plant-Specific Supplement 33 to NUREG—1437, Wake County, NC, Comment Period Ends: 03/05/2008, Contact: Samuel Hernandez 301–415– 4049.

EIS No. 20070524, Draft EIS, BLM, 00, PROGRAMMATIC EIS—Oil Shale and Tar Sands Resource Management (RMP) Amendments to Address Land Use Allocations in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming, Comment Period Ends: 03/20/2008, Contact: Michael Nedd 202–208–4201.

EIS No. 20070525, Final EIS, NPS, CA,
Big Lagoon Wetland and Creek
Restoration Project, To Restore a
Functional, Self-Sustaining
Ecosystem, including Wetland,
Riparian, and Aquatic Components,
Golden Gate National Area, Muir
Beach, Marin County, CA, Wait Period
Ends: 02/04/2008, Contact: Steve
Ortega 415–561–4841.

EIS No. 20070526, Draft EIS, AFS, WY,
Thunder Basin National Grassland
Prairie Dog Management Strategy,
Land and Resource Management Plan
Amendment #3, Proposes to
Implement a Site-Specific Strategy to
Manage Black Trailed Prairie Dog,
Douglas Ranger District, Medicine
Bow-Routt National Forests and
Thunder Basin National Grassland,
Campbell, Converse, Niobrara and
Weston Counties, WY, Comment
Period Ends: 02/04/2008, Contact:
Misty Hays 307–358–4690.

EIS No. 20070527, Draft EIS, JUS, NV, Las Vegas Detention Facility, Proposed Contractor-Owned/ Contractor-Operated Detention Facility, Implementation, Nevada Area, Comment Period Ends: 02/04/ 2008, Contact: Scott P. Stermer 202– 353–4601.

EIS No. 20070528, Final EIS, AFS, UT, Millville Peak/Logan Peak Road Relocation Project, Provide a Safe, Reliable, Ground Access Route, Logan Ranger District, Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Cache County, UT,