DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Resources and Services Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

Periodically, the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) publishes abstracts of information collection requests under review by the Office of Management and Budget, in compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). To request a copy of the clearance requests submitted to OMB for review, call the HRSA Reports Clearance Office on (301)–443–1129.

The following request has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for review under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995:

Proposed Project: The Health Education Assistance Loan (HEAL).

Program: Refinancing Loan Application/Promissory Note (OMB No. 0915–0227)—Revision—The HEAL Program allows borrowers who graduated or separated from school to refinance all of their HEAL loans into one new HEAL loan, often at better rates and terms than their original HEAL loans. The HEAL program originally provided new federally-insured loans to students in schools of allopathic medicine, osteopathic medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatric medicine, pharmacy, public health, graduate students in health administration or clinical psychology through September 30, 1998. Eligible lenders, such as banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions, pension funds, insurance companies, State agencies, and HEAL schools are insured by the Federal Government against loss due to the borrower's death, disability, bankruptcy, and default. The basic purpose of the program was to assure the availability of funds for loans to eligible students who needed to borrow money to pay for their educational costs.

The HEAL refinancing loan application/promissory note is being used by lenders to refinance borrower's original HEAL loans into one new refinanced loan. Due to the success of this form and desire to reduce application processing time many lenders have automated this form by taking pertinent application information over the telephone and sending the completed form to the borrower for their review and signature.

The estimate of burden for the refinancing loan application/promissory note form per year is as follows:

Type of respondent	Number of respondents	Responses per respondent	Total number of responses	Burden per responses (minutes)	Total burden hours
Applicants	1,850	1	1,850	12	370
Lenders	9	206	1,854	30	927
Total	1,859	....	3,704	....	1,297

Written comments and recommendations concerning the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of this notice to: John Morrall, Human Resources and Housing Branch, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: August 2, 2001.

Jane M. Harrison,

Director, Division of Policy Review and Coordination.

[FR Doc. 01–19853 Filed 8–7–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4165–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

Office of Planning & Performance Management; Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: To comply with the requirements of the Paper Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, we are inviting comments on an information collection request (ICR) that we will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. The ICR is entitled ''DOI Programmatic Clearance for Customer Satisfaction Surveys.'' The Department of the Interior (DOI) is soliciting comments on this ICR concerning the development and use of voluntary customer satisfaction surveys to gather input and feedback from the public.

DATES: Please submit written comments by October 9, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Mail or hand carry comments to the Department of the Interior; Office of Policy, Management and Budget; Office of Planning and Performance Management; Attention: Alan Turco; Mail Stop 5258; 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240. If you wish to email comments, the email address is: Alan_Turco@os.doi.gov. Reference ''DOI Programmatic Clearance for Customer Satisfaction Surveys'' in your email subject line. Include your name and return address in your email message and mark your message for return receipt.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alan Turco, Office of Planning and Performance Management, telephone (202) 219–2257. You may also contact Alan Turco to obtain a copy at no cost of the collection of information that will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: DOI Programmatic Clearance for Customer Satisfaction Surveys.

OMB Control Number: 10XX–XXXX.

Abstract: The mission of DOI is to protect and provide access to our Nation's natural and cultural heritage and honor our trust responsibilities to Indian Tribes and our commitments to island communities. DOI's Strategic Plan Overview (FY 2000–2005) lays out five goals: (1) Protect the environment and preserve our Nation's natural and cultural resources; (2) provide recreation for America; (3) manage natural resources for a healthy environment and a strong economy; (4) provide science for a changing world; and (5) meet our trust responsibilities to Indian Tribes and our commitments to island communities. Each bureau has established goals requiring collaboration and communication with the public—our partners and customers. Part of this communication occurs through surveys of the different users and stakeholders of DOI's products and services.

In the spirit of the PRA, DOI is consolidating its ICRs related to customer surveys for DOI offices and bureaus into one programmatic ICR. This single ICR will ease the public burden by submitting a generic format and set of standards that all customer-survey-related collections would follow in DOI. Because DOI's bureaus and offices have different customer and stakeholder groups, there will not be one ''boiler-plate'' approach to customer research. The ICR will describe those differences, where apparent. Although, where applicable, similar questions will be asked in the surveys of the bureaus and offices to allow better bench marking of customer service throughout DOI.

Background

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 (Pub. L. No. 103–62) sets out to ''improve Federal program effectiveness and public accountability by promoting a new focus on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction'' (Section 2. b. 3). In order to fulfill this responsibility, DOI's bureaus and offices must collect data from their respective user groups to (1) better understand the needs and desires of the public and (2) respond to those needs and desires accordingly.

This course of action is fortified by Executive Order (E.O.) 12862 (September 11, 1993) aimed at ''ensuring the Federal Government provides the highest quality service possible to the American people.'' The E.O. discusses surveys as a means for determining the kinds and qualities of service desired by the Federal Government's customers and for determining satisfaction levels for existing service. These voluntary customer surveys will be used to ascertain customer satisfaction with DOI's bureaus and offices in terms of services and products. Previous customer surveys have provided useful information to DOI's bureaus and offices for assessing how well we deliver our services and products, making improvements, and reporting on annual performance goals as set out in GPRA-related documents. The results are used internally, and summaries are provided to OMB on an annual basis and are used to satisfy the requirements and spirit of E.O. 12862.

Furthermore, E.O. 12862 requires agencies to provide a ''means to address customer complaints.'' To that end, bureaus and offices may use customer comment cards as an opportunity for customers to provide feedback to the agencies on the service they have received. Other methodologies discussed below also can meet this need.

In addition to GPRA and E.O. 12862, the statutes, regulations, and Secretarial Orders that created each of the bureaus and offices further enhance the need to engage the public and deliver quality products and services to our customers. Agency policies and procedures seek to promote quality customer service.

DOI's bureaus and offices anticipate performing their customer surveys under one ICR. In this proposal, DOI would request that OMB review the procedures and question areas for these surveys as a program, rather than reviewing each survey individually. Each bureau and office will then develop a survey instrument from the topic areas discussed below. Under the procedures proposed here, DOI would conduct the necessary quality control, including assurances that the individual survey comports with the guidelines in this proposed programmatic ICR, and submit the particular survey instruments and methodologies for expedited review to OMB.

Participating Bureaus and Offices

The proposed ICR covers most of the organizational agencies in DOI. However, the National Park Service, which has one of the most mature social science programs in the Federal Government, will continue under its own separate clearance given the complexity and specificity of their program. DOI's bureaus and offices covered under the proposed ICR include:

- Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Bureau of Reclamation
- US Fish & Wildlife Service
- Office of Insular Affairs
- Minerals Management Service
- Office of the Secretary
- Office of Surface Mining
- US Geological Survey (USGS)

Current Actions

The request to OMB will be for a 3-year clearance to conduct customer satisfaction surveys by DOI's bureaus and offices. USGS and BLM, who have developed customer research programs, are currently operating under 3-year programmatic clearances. Other participating bureaus and offices have handled their ICRs on a case-by-case basis.

For example, under existing approvals, USGS in 2000 surveyed users of the on-line National Atlas, State and Federal land managing and natural resource agencies, customers of Eros Data Center (digital data and maps), and customers of Earth Science Information Centers (topographic maps, USGS publications). Over the last 3 years, BLM has surveyed users of recreation areas, grazing permittees, oil and gas permittees, stakeholders and partners, and public room users, as well as conducted focus groups with various customer groups. These collections occur through one of six methodologies: (1) Intercept (a customer interacting in person with one conducting the survey); (2) telephone interviews; (3) mail surveys; (4) web-based surveys; (5) focus groups; and (6) voluntary use of comment cards.

Examples of previously conducted customer surveys are available upon request. Our planned activities in the next 3 fiscal years reflect our increased emphasis on and expansion of these activities throughout DOI.

Methodology

Customer Surveys: In all customer research, the goal of DOI is to employ the best statistical models that, in turn, will lead to the best data from which sound management decisions can be made. To that end, a 70 percent response rate has been set as a base threshold, with a goal of achieving an 80 percent response rate.

Different user and stakeholder groups function and interact with the respective bureaus and offices in different ways. In order to meet the response rate goal, six different methodologies will be available for use. The methodology will be chosen based on achieving statistical accuracy while keeping the cost as low as possible. The six methodologies that DOI's bureaus and offices will employ are: (1) Intercept, (2) telephone interviews, (3) mail surveys, (4) web-based surveys, (5) focus groups, and (6) comment cards. In all cases, the goal is to achieve a 95 percent confidence level for a specified degree of statistical accuracy. The total number of respondents sought for each survey will be based on achieving this level. In most cases, the respondent base will be pulled from a randomized sample of the user population, and where necessary, a stratified sample will be used to achieve accurate statistical measures at the appropriate National, State, or regional level. In some cases where the user population is small, the entire population will need to be surveyed.

Intercept: In a face-to-face situation, the survey instrument is provided to a respondent who completes it while on site and then returns it. The survey proctor is prepared to answer any questions the respondent may have about how to fill out the instrument but does not interfere or influence how the respondents answer the questions. This methodology provides the highest response rate—typically between 90–95 percent.

Telephone: Using existing databases, an interviewer will contact customers who have had a specific experience with the agency. The interviewer will dial back until the customer has been reached. Once contacted, the survey respondent is given a brief introduction to the survey, including its importance and use. The interviewer will then expeditiously move through the survey questions. When this methodology is employed, the typical response rate is between 70 and 85 percent, depending on the customer group.

Mail: Using existing lists of customer addresses, a three contact-approach based on Dillman's ''Tailored Design Method'' will be employed. The first contact is a cover letter explaining that a survey is coming to them and why it is important to the agency. The second contact will be the survey instrument itself along with a postage-paid addressed envelope to return the survey. The third contact will be a reminder postcard sent 10 days after the survey was sent. Finally, the respondents will receive a letter thanking them for the willingness to participate in the survey and reminding them to return it if they have not already done so. At each juncture, the respondents will be given multiple ways to contact someone with questions regarding the survey (including phone, FAX, web, and email). If the survey has been lost, the respondent can request that another be sent to them. Electronic mail is sometimes used instead of postal mail to communicate with customers. Although this is a cost-effective mode to survey a large group of people, it does not usually generate the best response rate. Telephone calls to non-respondents can be used to increase response rates.

Web-based: For products or services that are provided through electronic means, whether e-commerce or web-based information, a web survey may be most appropriate. During the course of their web interaction, users can volunteer to add their name to a list of future surveys. From this list, a respondent pool will be selected in accordance with the sampling procedures outlined above. An email will be sent to them explaining the need and importance of the survey with a web link to the survey. Within 5 days, a follow-up email will be sent to the respondents reminding them to complete the survey. Finally, the respondents will receive an email thanking them for the willingness to participate in the survey and reminding them to complete it if they have not already. The respondent will always have the option to submit the survey in paper form, should they elect to do so.

Focus Groups: Some data and information are best collected through more subjective, conversational means. A focus group is an informal, small-group discussion designed to obtain in-depth qualitative information. Individuals are specifically invited to participate in the discussion. Participants are encouraged to talk with each other about their experiences, preferences, needs, observations, or perceptions. A moderator whose role is to foster interaction leads the conversation. The moderator makes sure that all participants are encouraged to contribute and that no individual dominates the conversation. Furthermore, the moderator manages the discussion to make sure it does not stray too far from the topic of interest. Focus groups are most useful in an exploratory stage or when the bureau/office wants to develop a deeper understanding of a program or service.

Using the best in focus group research practices, groups will be constructed to include a cross-section of a given customer group. The questions and additional probes used during the focus groups will be consistent with the ''guideline menu'' discussed below.

Comment Cards: As discussed in the Background section above, agencies have been instructed to provide a means to address customer complaints. To facilitate this, comment cards may be employed. Comment cards, when provided to a customer at the time a product or service is provided, offer an excellent means to give the bureaus and offices feedback. A comment card should have a limited number of questions and an opportunity to comment. These comment cards provide managers and service providers with direct, specific, and timely information from their customers about new service problems as they crop up, or extraordinary performance, that could not be obtained through any other means.

Electronic users may be offered the opportunity to complete a comment card via a ''pop-up'' window (or other web-enable means that may be available). The ''pop-up'' window will not appear for every user; rather, the users will be randomly selected to receive the survey. This practice is widely used in private industry. In other instances, the electronic user may be offered the option to self-select in answering the electronic comment card.

Whether using paper or electronic comment cards, the intent is to provide a timely feedback mechanism. The data are not intended to be statistically significant. Although questions may include numeric scales, those data should be considered only in an anecdotal fashion and not reported as a significant measure.

Remuneration/Incentives: A great deal of the literature related to customer satisfaction research recommends that incentives, monetary and non-monetary, be used to increase response rates. Bureaus and offices acting in a regulatory role would not seek to provide remuneration to their permittees, for example. Bureaus and offices, though, that operate in a more service-related mode, such as wildlife refuge visitation, may find incentives to be both helpful and appropriate. Specific remuneration/incentives are not being proposed here, but we are interested in the public's input as to their need and appropriateness.

Topic Areas. DOI's bureaus and offices propose to survey customers in the following general categories:

- Authorized public land users (rights-of-way, land management transactions, mining, recreation, oil and gas, grazing, wildlife photographers, hunters, fishers, etc.)
- Coal operators
- Contractors/venders
- Disabled persons and groups representing disabled persons
- Educators/researchers
- Environmental groups
- Government representatives (State, local, and foreign)
- Grant recipients
- Indian Tribes/Alaskan Natives/Native Americans
- Industry groups (i.e., mining, oil and gas)
- Insular governments
- Interested publics/special interest groups
- Law enforcement authorities, customs brokers, and brokers' associations
- Local communities
- Public information center users
- Scientific data users and technical assistance recipients
- State wildlife agencies' representatives
- Trade organizations
- Utilities' representatives
- Visitors/Recreation
- Volunteers (past, present, prospective)

See ''Table: Customer Types by Participating Bureau/Office'' for details. This table shows the likely groups that would be surveyed by each bureau and office but is not intended to limit the bureau and office to only these groups.

There are 11 topic areas that DOI's bureaus and offices are proposing to voluntarily obtain information from its customers and stakeholders. No one survey will cover all the topic areas;

rather, this serves as a ''guideline menu'' from which the agencies would develop their questions. Example(s) of the types of questions that would be asked under each topic are provided. Under the proposed ICR, the agencies could use these specific questions or develop questions that fit within the generally understood confines of the topic area.

With the exception of the general demographic questions, the questions will be answered on a Lichert Scale (i.e., choose one of the following: strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree, strongly disagree; on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being very poor and 5 being excellent, etc.), from a preset list of options (i.e., yes, no, not applicable), or as an open-ended question. For questions that use the Lichert scale and a preset list of options, the data will be reported in a numeric fashion, including average response and percent favorable. Open-ended questions will be subjected to a content analysis and be reported on accordingly.

1. Communication/information/education:

a. Providing consistent and timely information to the public.

b. Where did you obtain your information about this site?

c. Making it easy for people to find out about proposed changes.

d. Educating people about particular processes.

e. Providing accurate, detailed and affordable maps and brochures.

f. Providing useful web site, signs, publications, and exhibits

g. Charging an appropriate fee for the information/material provided.

h. The information provided was effective and helpful.

i. Providing quality web-based information.

j. Engaging the public in the planning process.

2. Disability accessibility:

a. Do you or does someone in your party have a disability?

b. If yes, how well does the agency make buildings, facilities, and trails accessible to people with disabilities?

c. Accessibility to the programs and activities that address my needs.

3. Facilities:

a. Maintaining roads and trails.

b. Maintaining a clean recreation site.

c. Providing entrance/directional signs to sites and facilities.

d. Providing a facility that is conducive to meeting specific user needs.

4. Management practices:

a. Responding to issues and problems in a timely manner.

b. Providing access to a supervisor to resolve the problem.

c. Understanding my needs.

d. If you could make one improvement to XXX service, what would it be?

5. Resource protection and use:

a. The extent to which the natural resources are used and cultural resources are protected.

b. Getting public input when identifying critical areas for preservation and use.

c. Preserving water resources and habitat for fish, wildlife, plants, and other uses.

6. Rules, regulations, policies:

a. Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations.

b. Ensure fair and consistent policies for all users.

c. The rules, regulations, and policies are clear and in plain language.

d. Providing adequate protest and appeal policies to resolve issues and disputes.

7. Service delivery:

a. Provided a single point of contact.

b. The staff I interacted with are courteous and friendly.

c. The staff I interacted with are knowledgeable about the rules and regulations.

d. The staff I interacted with are able to answer my questions about natural, historic, and cultural resources.

e. The staff listened to and considered my ideas.

f. The training I received provided the information I needed.

g. The response was timely.

8. Technical assistance:

a. Provides unbiased scientific and technical support products and services.

b. Reflects reasonable pricing.

c. Quality of the execution of the analysis and interpretation.

d. Considered alternative interpretations.

e. Provides useful information.

9. Program-specific: (These questions will reflect the specific details of the program that pertain to the customer respondents. The questions will be developed to address very specific and/or technical issues related to the program. The questions will be geared toward gaining a better understanding about how to provide specific products and services as well as the priority the public would give to specific program objectives; they will not ask the respondents for their opinions about policies.)

10. Overall satisfaction:

a. Everything considered, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the delivery of XXX program or service?

b. Values my relationship as a customer.

c. Is an agency I will contact or visit again for information and services.

d. Is an agency I trust to do a good job performing XXX mission.

11. General demographics:

a. What is your zip code?

b. How many times have you used this service in the previous 12 months?

c. How many people are in your group?

d. What activities did you participate in?

e. What was your total household income (before taxes) in 2000 (less than $20,000; $20,000 to $39,999; $40,000 to $59,999; $60,000 to $79,999; $80,000 to $99,999; $100,000 to $119,999; $120,000 or more)?

f. What is the highest level of education you have completed (some high school or less; high school graduate or GED; business school, trade school, or some college; college graduate; some graduate school; masters, Ph.D., or professional degree)?

g. What is the primary language spoken at home? (i.e., English, Spanish)

h. In what ethnic group would you place yourself (Hispanic/Latino or non-Hispanic/Latino)?

i. In what race would you place yourself (American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut; Asian or Pacific Islander; Black or African America; White; Native Hawaiian)? Select one or more.

Uses of Data: Chiefly, these data are being collected to improve the service and products that the participating bureaus and offices provide to the public. Managers and program specialists use these data to identify:

- Service needs and priorities of customers
- Strengths and weaknesses of services
- Ideas or suggestions for improvement of services from our customers
- Barriers to achieving customer service standards
- Changes to customer service standards
- Establishing baselines to measure change in improving service delivery over time
- Improving public trust in government

They also use this information to support all aspects of planning, from buildings, roads, and interpretive exhibits, to technical systems. In conducting their management, planning, and monitoring activities, managers also use the information to effectively allocate their limited personnel and financial resources to the highest priority elements.

While the information will not be used for budgetary development, DOI anticipates that the information obtained could lead to reallocation of resources, revisions in certain agency processes and policies, and development of guidance related to the agency's customer services. Ultimately, these changes should result in improvement in services DOI provides to the public and, in turn, the public perception of DOI.

In fulfilling the requirements of GPRA, DOI and all of its bureaus and offices have created a Strategic Plan in coordination with their respective publics. GPRA requires DOI and its bureaus to annually report on their progress toward achieving the goals outlined in the Annual Performance Plan. Some of the data collected may be used as the basis or in support of specific performance measures.

Frequency: The frequency varies by survey.

Estimated Number and Description of Respondents: See attached ''Table: Customer Types by Participating Bureau/Office'' for list of respondents. This table shows the likely groups that would be surveyed by each bureau and office but is not intended to limit the bureau and office to such groups.

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping ''Hour'' Burden: The average public reporting burden for a customer survey is estimated to be 15 minutes per respondent. For comment cards, the average public reporting burden is estimated to be 3 minutes per response. Given these estimates, DOI anticipates a need to budget 18,000 hours per year for these proposed collections. Burden includes the total time, effort, or financial resources expended to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide the information, including: (1) Reviewing instructions; (2) developing, acquiring, installing, and utilizing technology and systems for purposes of collecting, validating, verifying, processing, maintaining, disclosing, and providing information; (3) adjusting the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; (4) training personnel to respond to a collection of information; (5) searching data sources; (6) completing and reviewing the collection of information; and (7) transmitting or otherwise disclosing information. Please comment on the accuracy of our estimates and how DOI's bureaus and offices could minimize the burden of the collection information, including the use of automated techniques.

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping ''Non-Hour Cost'' Burden: We have identified no ''non-hour costs'' burdens.

Comments: The PRA provides that a Federal 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. Before submitting an ICR to OMB, PRA section 3506(c)(2)(A) requires each agency '' * * * to provide notice * * * and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information * * *.'' Agencies must specifically solicit comments to: (a) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the agency to perform its duties, including whether the information is useful; (b) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) minimize the burden on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Furthermore, we are interested in your comments regarding the need for and appropriateness of remuneration/incentives, or other suggestions you may have to increase response rates. We will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in our submission for OMB approval, including any appropriate adjustments to the estimated burden.

Agencies must estimate both the ''hour'' burden and ''non-hour cost'' burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. We have not identified any non-hour cost burdens for the information collection aspects of the programmatic customer satisfaction survey. Therefore, if you have costs to generate, maintain, and disclose this information, you should comment and provide your total capital and startup cost components or annual operation, maintenance, and purchase of service components. You should describe the methods you use to estimate major cost factors, including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, discount rate(s), and the period of which you incur costs. Capital and startup costs include, among other items, computers and software you purchase to prepare for collecting information, monitoring, and record storage facilities. Generally, your estimates should not include equipment or services purchased: (1) Before October 1, 1995; (2) to comply with requirements not associated with the information collection; (3) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the Government; or (4) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review during regular business hours. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their home address from the record, which we will honor to the extent allowable by law. There may be circumstances in which we would withhold from the record a respondent's identity, as allowable by law. If you, as a commenter, wish us to withhold your name and/or address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. However, we will not consider anonymous comments. We will make all submissions from organizations or business, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety.

Dated: July 9, 2001.

Norma Campbell,

Director, Office of Planning and Performance Management.

TABLE—CUSTOMER TYPE BY PARTICIPATING BUREAU/OFFICE

	description	BIA	BLM	BOR	FWS	Insular aff	MMS	OAPM	OEP	OSM	USGS
Authorized public land uses	ROW, Land Mgmt transactions, min	X									
Coal operators										X	
Contractors/venders	concessionaires	X			X			X			
Disabilities			X		X						
Environmental groups			X		X		X				X
Governments	state, local, foreign	X	X	X	X		X				X
Grant recipients								X			
Indian Tribes/Alaskan villages		X			X					X	X
Industry groups			X	X	X		X	X			X
Insular governments						X					
Interested publics	community and specific-interest groups forensics, importers/exporters.			X	X		X			X	X
Law Enforcement					X						
Mining companies											X
Public information centers			X		X						
Scientific data users	GIS				X						
State governments		X	X	X	X		X			X	X
State wildlife agencies	state biologists	X			X						
Universities/Educators				X	X		X	X	X		
Utilities				X							
Visitors/Recreation	visitors to federal land, bird watcher		X	X	X						

[FR Doc. 01–19828 Filed 8–7–01; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–RK–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Notice of Availability, Final Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment

AGENCY: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), on behalf of the Department of the Interior (DOI), as a Natural Resource Trustee (Trustee), announces the release of the Final Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment (RP/EA) for Operable Unit 3 (OU–3) of the Asbestos Dump Superfund Site, Morris County, New Jersey. The Final RP/EA describes the DOI's selected action to restore natural resources injured as a result of chemical contamination at the Asbestos Dump Superfund Site.

ADDRESSES: Requests for copies of the Final RP/EA may be made to: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, New Jersey Field Office, 927 North Main Street, Pleasantville, New Jersey, 08232.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Clay Stern, Environmental Contaminants Branch, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, New Jersey Field Office, 927 North Main Street, Pleasantville, New Jersey, 08232. Interested parties may also call 609–646–9310, x27 or send electronic mail to clay—stern@fws.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the authority of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980 as amended, commonly known as Superfund, (42 U.S.C. 9601 *et seq.*), * * * ''[Trustees] may assess damages to natural resources resulting from a discharge of oil or a release of a hazardous substance * * * and may seek to recover those damages.'' Natural resource damage assessments are separate from the cleanup actions undertaken at a hazardous waste site, and provide a process whereby the Trustees can determine the proper compensation to the public for injury to natural resources. At OU–3 of the Asbestos Dump Superfund Site in Morris County, New Jersey, DOI was the sole natural resource trustee involved in the Federal government's settlement with the National Gypsum Corporation (NGC). The Service, acting on behalf of the DOI, determined that contamination at OU–3 had degraded and injured trust resources within the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge. The injuries resulted from the deposition of asbestos containing materials, and mercuric and lead based compounds at the 5.58-acre site.

As part of a Consent Decree requiring remedial actions at OU–3, DOI settled with NGC for natural resource damages. The settlement of approximately $3.6 million was designated for restoration, replacement, or acquisition of the equivalent natural resources injured by the release of contaminants at the site.

The Final RP/EA is being released in accordance with the Natural Resource Damage Assessment Regulations found at Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulation Part 11. The Final RP/EA describes several natural resource restoration, acquisition, and protection alternatives identified by the DOI, and evaluates each of the possible alternatives based on all relevant considerations. The DOI's Preferred Alternative is to use the settlement funds in a combination of projects aimed to restore, enhance, and protect in perpetuity, fish and wildlife habitat within the Great Swamp Watershed. Details regarding the proposed projects are contained in the Final RP/EA.

The Final Revised Procedures for the DOI in implementing the National Environmental Policy Act were published in the **Federal Register** on January 16, 1997. Under those procedures the DOI has determined that the Preferred Alternative will not have significant environmental effects as described in the Draft RP/EA and the attached Finding of No Significant Impact Statement. Accordingly, the Preferred Alternative described in the Draft RP/EA will not require preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

Author

The primary author of this notice is Clay Stern, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, New Jersey Field Office, 927 North Main Street, Pleasantville, New Jersey, 08232.

Authority

The authority for this action is the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980 as amended, commonly known as Superfund, (42 U.S.C. 9601 *et seq.*).

Dated: July 24, 2001.

Mamie A. Parker,

Acting Regional Director, Region 5, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 01–19850 Filed 8–7–01; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, Whiskeytown Unit, Shasta County, CA Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for Fire Management Plan

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, in accord with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), that public scoping has been initiated for a conservation planning and environmental impact analysis effort intended to update the Fire Management Plan (FMP) for the Whiskeytown National Recreation Area. The purpose of the scoping process is to elicit early public comment regarding current issues and concerns, a suitable range of alternatives, the nature and extent of potential environmental impacts, appropriate mitigating measures, and other matters which should to be addressed in the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Background: The Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area was created by Congress in 1965. The Whiskeytown Unit is administered as a unit of the National Park Service (NPS), with the Shasta and Trinity units of the National Recreation Area administered by the USDA Forest Service. Research has shown that fire is a significant natural process across a large portion of the 42,500 acres within the authorized boundaries of the park. Following several decades of total fire suppression, a fire management program was begun in the 1970s and has continued to the present time. Three forms of wildland fire management have been used to achieve natural and cultural resource management and hazard fuel reduction goals; aggressive suppression of unwanted wildfires; prescribed burning; and mechanical fuel reduction.

The last revision of the FMP was based upon completion of an Environmental Assessment process, which culminated in a Finding Of No Significant Impact approval of the program in 1993. However, since that time a broad range of new issues, improved information and technology, and unforeseeable limitations have emerged which have the potential to affect the future direction of the fire management program within the park. Some of these issues include but are not limited to: a continued decline in ecosystem health due to fire suppression; increased hazardous fuels buildup; expanding uses and development at the wildland-urban interface; increased risks and costs