Dated: November 2, 2004

Oscar Morales,

Director, Collection Strategies Division.
[FR Doc. 04–25216 Filed 11–10–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[Docket No: WA-04-005; FRL-7837-1]

Adequacy Status of the Yakima PM₁₀ Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request for Transportation Conformity Purposes

AGENCY: Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of adequacy.

SUMMARY: In this notice, EPA is notifying the public that we have found the Yakima PM₁₀ Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request adequate for transportation conformity purposes. On March 2, 1999, the D.C. Circuit Court ruled that submitted State Implementation Plans (SIPs) cannot be used for conformity determinations until EPA has found them adequate. As a result of this adequacy finding, the area automatically meets the budget test for future transportation conformity. This affects future transportation conformity determinations prepared, reviewed and approved by the Yakima Valley Council of Governments, Washington State Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration.

DATES: This finding is effective November 29, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The finding is available at EPA's conformity Web site: http://www.epa.gov/otaq/transp.htm, (once there, click on the "Transportation Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions"). You may also contact Wayne Elson, U.S. EPA, Region 10, Office of Air, Waste, and Toxics (AWT–107), 1200 Sixth Ave, Seattle WA 98101; (206) 553–1463 or elson.wayne@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Today's notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. EPA Region 10 sent a letter to the Washington Department of Ecology, October 12, 2004, stating that the SIP is adequate for transportation conformity purposes.

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA's conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to SIPs. 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 we determine whether a SIP is adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review and it also should not be used to prejudge our ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find a SIP adequate for conformity, the SIP could later be disapproved.

We have described our process for determining the adequacy in SIPs in guidance dated May 14, 1999. This guidance is now reflected in the amended transportation conformity rule, July 1, 2004 (69 FR 40004). We followed this process in making our adequacy determination.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Dated: November 4, 2004.

Ronald A. Kreizenbeck,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10. [FR Doc. 04–25221 Filed 11–10–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6657-6]

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-G65094-NM Rating LO, Ojo Caliente Proposed Transmission Line, Authorization for Construction, Operation, and Maintenance of a New 115kV Transmission Line and Substation, Carson National Forest and BLM Taos Field Office, Taos and Rio Arriba Counties, NM.

Summary: EPA has no objection to the selection of the preferred Alternative D with options. ERP No. D-AFS-J65424-MT Rating EC2, Fishtrap Project, Proposed Timber Harvest, Prescribed Burning Road Construction and Other Restoration Activities, Lolo National Forest, Plains/Thompson Falls Ranger District, Sanders County, MT.

Summary: EPA supports Alternative 2 and it's potential to improve water quality, reduce road density and decrease habitat fragmentation in the long-term. However, EPA expressed concerns about the short-term impacts of increased sedimentation on water quality and bull trout. EPA recommend earlier implementation of road BMP improvements and road restoration relative to timber harvest and road construction, and additional road closure and decommissioning in the Upper Fishtrap drainage.

ERP No. D–DHS–D11036–MD Rating EC2, National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center (NBACC) Facility at Fort Detrick, Construction and Operation, Fort Detrick, Frederick County, MD.

Summary: EPA is concerned with the fracture trace located directly on the proposed project site and the potential impacts to groundwater.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-AFS-K65263-CA Meteor Project, Proposal for Harvesting Timber and Conducting Associated Activities on 744 Acres, Implementation, Klamath National Forest, Salmon River Ranger District, Siskiyou County, CA.

Summary: The Final EIS addressed EPA's concerns and no formal comments were sent to the preparing agency.

Dated: November 8, 2004.

Robert W. Hargrove,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 04–25202 Filed 11–10–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6657-5]

Environmental Impact 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 November 1, 2004. Through November 5, 2004