

For this pilot study, 16 neighborhoods will be selected in two metropolitan areas (Phoenix, AZ and Syracuse, NY). Each neighborhood sample will be split into two groups, with 50 households assigned to a mail survey group and 50 households assigned to an in-person survey group. The in-person survey will be conducted in a manner that minimizes the differences between the two survey modes.

Comments are invited on: (1) The practical utility of the information being gathered; (2) the accuracy of the burden hour estimate; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden to respondents, including use of automated information collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

*Frequency of collection:* Once.

*Description of Respondents:* Residents of Atlanta, GA, Chicago, IL, Sacramento, CA (focus groups) and Phoenix, AZ and Syracuse, NY (response rate pilot study).

*Estimated average number or respondents:* Focus groups: 1,200 in recruitment and 120 in pre-testing activities. Pilot study: 480 mail refusals, 320 in-person refusals, and 800 respondents.

*Estimated average number of responses:* 920 (120 responses for focus groups; 800 responses for pilot study).

*Estimated average time burden per respondent:* 2.5 hours for focus group respondents, 20 minutes for pilot survey respondents.

*Frequency of response:* 1 time per respondent.

*Estimated total annual reporting burden:* 567 hours.

Dated: July 12, 2007.

**Leonard E. Stowe,**

NPS, Information Collection Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 07-3916 Filed 8-9-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-52-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Reclamation

#### Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG)

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Reclamation, Interior

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Adaptive Management Program (AMP) was implemented as a result of the Record of Decision on the Operation of Glen Canyon Dam Final Environmental Impact Statement to comply with consultation requirements of the Grand Canyon Protection Act (Pub. L. 102-575) of 1992. The AMP includes a federal advisory committee (AMWG), a technical work group (TWG), a monitoring and research center, and independent review panels. The AMWG makes recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior concerning Glen Canyon Dam operations and other management actions to protect resources downstream of Glen Canyon Dam consistent with the Grand Canyon Protection Act. The TWG is a subcommittee of the AMWG and provides technical advice and recommendations to the AMWG.

*Dates and Addresses:* The AMWG will conduct the following public meeting:

Flagstaff, Arizona—August 29–30, 2007. The meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m. and conclude at 5:30 p.m. on the first day and begin at 8 a.m. and conclude at 4 p.m. on the second day. The meeting will be held at the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center, 2255 N. Gemini Drive, Building 3 Main Conference Room, Flagstaff, Arizona.

*Agenda:* The purpose of the meeting will be to (1) Review and develop a recommendation to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year 2008 Budget, Workplan, and hydrograph; (2) receive updates on the Monitoring and Research Plan, the Beach/Habitat Building Flow Science Plan, public outreach efforts, Long-Term Experimental Plan Environmental Impact Study, and Humpback Chub Recovery Implementation Plan; (3) review fiscal year 2007 mid-year program expenditures; (4) discuss the Roles Ad Hoc Group Report; and (5) discuss basin hydrology/climate changes, and other administrative and resource issues pertaining to the AMP. To view a copy of the draft agenda, please visit Reclamation's Web site at: <http://www.usbr.gov/uc/rm/amp/amwg/mtgs/07aug29/index.html>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Randall Peterson, Bureau of

Reclamation, telephone (801) 524-3758; facsimile (801) 524-3858; e-mail at [rpeterson@uc.usbr.gov](mailto:rpeterson@uc.usbr.gov).

To allow full consideration of information by the AMWG members, written notice must be provided to Randall Peterson, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Regional Office, 125 South State Street, Room 6107, Salt Lake City, Utah 84138; telephone (801) 524-3758; faxogram (801) 524-3858; e-mail at [rpeterson@uc.usbr.gov](mailto:rpeterson@uc.usbr.gov) at least five (5) days prior to the meeting. Any written comments received will be provided to the AMWG members.

Dated: July 19, 2007.

**Randall V. Peterson,**

Manager, Environmental Resources Division, Upper Colorado Regional Office, Salt Lake City, Utah.

[FR Doc. E7-15699 Filed 8-9-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P

## INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

### United States Section; Notice of Availability of Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Improvements to the USIBWC Rio Grande Flood Control Projects Along the Texas-Mexico Border

**AGENCY:** United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC).

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC) has prepared a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Draft PEIS) for future improvements to three Rio Grande Flood Control Projects (FCP) operated by the USIBWC along the Texas-Mexico Border: the Rectification FCP, the Presidio FCP and Lower Rio Grande FCP. The PEIS, prepared in cooperation with the United States Bureau of Reclamation, United States Fish and Wildlife Service and United States Army Corps of Engineers, analyzes potential impacts of the No Action Alternative and three action alternatives for future FCP improvements under consideration.

Because several measures under consideration are at a conceptual level of development, the USIBWC has taken a broad programmatic look at the