

Docket number	Date received	Presenter or requester
3. CP05-412-000	1-17-06	Van Button; Ken Markonis.
4. CP05-412-000	1-17-06	Van Button; Kathy Cash.
5. Project No. 2216-000	1-17-06	Doug Anderson.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6-1438 Filed 2-2-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA-HQ-OA-2006-0080; FRL-8026-8]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Valuing Reduced Asthma Episodes for Adults and Children-Focus Groups; EPA ICR Number 2215.01

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that EPA is planning to submit a request for a new Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Before submitting the ICR to OMB for review and approval, EPA is soliciting comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection as described below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before April 4, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, referencing docket ID number EPA-HQ-OA-2006-0080, by one of the following methods:

- <http://www.regulations.gov>: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

- E-mail: dockins.chris@epa.gov.

- Fax: 202-566-2338.

- Mail: Office of Environmental Information (OEI) Docket, Environmental Protection Agency, Mailcode 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460.

- Hand Deliver: Office of Environmental Information (OEI) Docket in the EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Docket's normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OA-2006-

0080. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through <http://www.regulations.gov> or e-mail. The <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site is an "anonymous access" system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA without going through <http://www.regulations.gov> your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD-ROM you submit. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses. For additional information about EPA's public docket visit the EPA Docket Center homepage at <http://www.epa.gov/epahome/dockets.htm>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Chris Dockins, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, U.S. EPA, Mail Code 1809T, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number 202-566-2286; fax number 202-566-2338; e-mail address: dockins.chris@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

How Can I Access the Docket and/or Submit Comments?

EPA has established a public docket for this ICR under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OA-2006-0080, which is available for online viewing at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or in person viewing at the Office of Environmental

Information (OEI) Docket in the EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. The EPA/DC Public Reading Room is open from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Reading Room is 202-566-1744, and the telephone number for the Office of Environmental Information (OEI) Docket is 202-566-1752.

Use <http://www.regulations.gov> to obtain a copy of the draft collection of information, submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, select "search," then key in the docket ID number identified in this document.

What Information Is EPA Particularly Interested In?

Pursuant to section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, EPA specifically solicits comments and information to enable it to:

(i) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) Evaluate the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses. In particular, EPA is requesting comments from very small businesses (those that employ less than 25) on examples of specific additional efforts that EPA could make to reduce the paperwork burden for very small businesses affected by this collection.

What Should I Consider When I Prepare My Comments for EPA?

You may find the following suggestions helpful for preparing your comments:

1. Explain your views as clearly as possible and provide specific examples.
2. Describe any assumptions that you used.
3. Provide copies of any technical information and/or data you used that support your views.
4. If you estimate potential burden or costs, explain how you arrived at the estimate that you provide.
5. Offer alternative ways to improve the collection activity.
6. Make sure to submit your comments by the deadline identified under **DATES**.
7. 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.

What Information Collection Activity or ICR Does This Apply To?

Affected Entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are individuals volunteering to participate in focus group discussions.

Title: Valuing Reduced Asthma Episodes for Adults and Children—Focus Groups.

ICR Numbers: EPA ICR No. 2215.01.

ICR Status: This ICR is for a new information collection activity. 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 part 9.

Abstract: Asthma is one of the most common chronic illnesses in the United States, particularly among children. The disease is characterized by recurring episodes of symptoms like cough, shortness of breath, and wheezing. Epidemiological studies suggest that ambient air pollution may contribute to exacerbation of these episodes. Acute asthma episodes are a leading cause of work and school absence and contribute to the economic burden of the disease. The policies and programs of many

public and private entities including EPA may affect the frequency and severity of asthma episodes, but economic analysis of these programs is hindered by inadequate information about the economic benefits of reduced asthma episodes. The proposed surveys would gather information to support estimation of willingness to pay (WTP) to avoid acute episodes of asthma exacerbation for adults and children.

The survey research has three main objectives. The first is to estimate WTP to reduce frequency of asthma episodes. The second is to examine how the "attributes" of asthma episodes, such as their frequency, severity and symptoms, affect WTP. The third is to provide some evidence on the WTP to reduce the severity of asthma episodes, while holding frequency constant. WTP would be estimated in the context of the severity of the individual's asthma and the activities taken to manage the disease. The resulting estimates will help to provide researchers and policy analysts with a systematic and credible basis for valuing policies that influence acute asthma episodes.

Through a cooperative agreement from EPA (R-83062801-0), researchers at the University of Central Florida (UCF) have designed and are proposing to conduct two nationwide surveys of adult individuals. One survey would be administered to a sample of adults with physician-diagnosed asthma who have experienced asthma symptoms during the 12 months preceding the survey. This survey focuses on eliciting adults' WTP to reduce the asthma episodes that they experience. The other survey would be administered to a national sample of parents of children with physician-diagnosed asthma who have experienced asthma symptoms during the 12 months preceding the survey. In this case, the focus is on eliciting parents' WTP to reduce the asthma episodes that their children experience.

The purpose of the proposed ICR is to gain approval for the conduct of a series of focus groups and individual interviews as part of the survey development process. Focus groups and cognitive interviews are a crucial component in the survey development process as they allow survey developers to identify problematic approaches, terminology, and graphics in the survey instrument. A total of 50 interviews are anticipated, including focus group responses and individual interviews.

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 are listed

in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15.

The EPA would like to solicit comments in order to:

- (i) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- (ii) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- (iii) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

- (iv) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 2 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; 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 only burden imposed by the interviews on respondents will be the time required to participate in focus group discussions and answer interview questions. The survey developers estimate that this will require an average of 2 hours per respondent. With a total of 50 respondents this requires a total of 100 hours. Based on an average hourly rate of \$26.05¹ (including employer costs of all employee benefits), the survey developers expect that the average per-respondent cost for the pilot survey will be \$52.10 and the

¹ Employer costs per hour worked for employee compensation and costs as a percent of total compensation: Civilian workers, total compensation, December 2005 (<http://stats.bls.gov/news.release/cecc.t02.htm>).

corresponding one-time total cost to all respondents will be \$5210.00. Since this information collection is voluntary and does not involve any special equipment, respondents will not incur any capital or operation and maintenance (O&M) costs.

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: January 5, 2006.

Al McGartland,

Director, National Center for Environmental Economics, Office of Policy Economics and Innovation.

[FR Doc. E6-1503 Filed 2-2-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6671-9]

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 1, 2005 (70 FR 16815).

Draft EISs

EIS No. 20050362, ERP No. D-NRC-E05101-NC, Generic—Brunswick Stream Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2 (TAC Nos. MC4641 and MC4642) License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, Supplement 25 to NUREG-1437, Brunswick County, NC.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about radiological monitoring of all plant effluents, and appropriate storage and ultimate disposition of radioactive

waste generated on-site during the license renewal period, as well as continuing measures to limit bioentrapment and other impacts to aquatic species from surface water withdrawals and discharges. Rating EC1.

EIS No. 20050396, ERP No. D-BIA-K60036-CA, Elk Valley Rancheria Martin Ranch 203.5-Acre Fee-to-Trust Transfer and Casino/Resort Project, Implementation, Federal Trust, Elk Valley Rancheria Tribe, Crescent City, Del Norte County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns about impacts to wetlands and uncertainties in the stormwater management system. EPA recommended the final EIS include an adaptive management plan for the vegetated swale system and clarify the need for a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit for road crossings. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20050425, ERP No. D-BLM-K65292-CA, Southern Diablo Mountain Range and Central Coast of California Resource Management Plan, Several Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns and recommended additional measures be taken to reduce impacts to human health, watershed and vegetation resources in the planning area. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20050435, ERP No. D-NOA-E86003-00, Snapper Grouper Fishery, Amendment 13C to the Fishery Management Plan, Phase Out Overfishing of Snowy Grouper, Golden Tilefish, Vermilion Snapper and Sea Bass, Implementation, South Atlantic Region.

Summary: While EPA had no objection to the proposed action, EPA did request clarification of EJ demographics of fishermen. Rating LO.

EIS No. 20050438, ERP No. D-COE-E11058-SC, Charleston Naval Complex (CNC), Proposed Construction of a Marine Container Terminal, Cooper River in Charleston Harbor, City of North Charleston, Charleston County, SC.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to aquatic resources, water quality and air quality. EPA also requested additional information regarding the potential impacts. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20050450, ERP No. D-SFW-F64006-IL, Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP), Implementation, Williamson, Jackson and Union Counties, IL.

Summary: While EPA had no objections to the proposed action, EPA

did request clarification on partnerships to reduce water pollution and additional surveys covering area-sensitive forest birds and grassland and shrubland birds. Rating LO.

EIS No. 20050484, ERP No. D-COE-K36143-CA, American River Watershed, Lower American River Common Features Mayhew Levee Project, Reconstruction, Sacramento County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns that several alternatives would convert the American River Parkway to levee and maintenance roads and would impact oak woodland habitat. EPA recommended the selection of either Alternative 4 or 5 to reduce impacts to riparian vegetation and requested additional information regarding cumulative impacts to air and water quality in the area. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20050507, ERP No. D-BLM-K65293-NV, Sheep Complex, Big Springs and Owyhee Grazing Allotments Sensitive Bird Species Project, Determine Impacts of Livestock Grazing, Elko County, NV.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the potential for continued impacts to vegetation, cultural resources, wildlife habitat and sensitive species under the proposed level of grazing. The Final EIS should include additional information on mitigation measures. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20050539, ERP No. D-GSA-K61163-CA, Andrade Port of Entry (POE) Improvements Project, Proposed Expansion, Renovation, or Replacement of POE, Andrade, CA.

Summary: EPA had concerns about cumulative impacts to air quality, water quality, biological resources and cultural resources. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20050413, ERP No. DS-FHW-E40339-NC, NC 12 Replacement of Herbert C. Bonner Bridge (Bridge No. 11) New and Updated Information, over Oregon Inlet Construction, Funding, U.S. Coast Guard Permit, Special-Use-Permit, Right-of-Way Permit, US Army COE Section 10 and 404 Permit, Dare County, NC.

Summary: EPA has environmental objections to proposed project alternatives that would continue to bisect the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge (PINWR) and likely result in long-term impacts to water quality as well as disturbances to essential habitat for migratory water fowl and resident wildlife. Pamlico Sound bridge alternatives (PSBC), however, would traverse open water and result in less adverse environmental impacts by