of the CFR, after appearing in the **Federal Register**, are listed in 40 CFR part 9, and included on the related collection instrument or form, if applicable.

Abstract: The Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) requires LEAs to conduct inspections, develop management plans, and design or conduct response actions with respect to the presence of asbestoscontaining materials in school buildings. AHERA also requires states to develop model accreditation plans for persons who perform asbestos inspections, develop management control plans, and design or conduct response actions. This information collection addresses the burden associated with recordkeeping requirements imposed on LEAs by the asbestos in schools rule, and reporting and recordkeeping requirements imposed on states and training providers related to the model accreditation plan rule.

Responses to the collection of information are mandatory (see 40 CFR part 763, subpart E). Respondents may claim all or part of a notice 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.

III. What are EPA's Burden and Cost Estimates for this ICR?

Under the PRA, "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. For this collection it 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 ICR provides a detailed explanation of this estimate, which is only briefly summarized in this notice. The annual public burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 21.5 hours per respondent. The following is a summary of the estimates taken from the ICR:

Respondents/affected entities: 107,800.

Estimated total number of potential respondents: 107,800.

Frequency of response: On occasion. Estimated total/average number of responses for each respondent: 1.

Estimated total annual burden hours: 2,321,989 hours.

Estimated total annual burden costs: \$61,701,552.

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

This request reflects an increase of 109,838 hours (from 2,212,151 hours to 2,321,989 hours) in the total estimated respondent burden from that currently in the OMB inventory. This increase is due to a change in the method of calculating total annual burden for LEAs. In previous ICR renewals, total burden was estimated for the remainder of the 30-year implementation period, then averaged over each of the remaining years to estimate annual burden. Because burden is expected to decline over time as schools exit the respondent universe, this method produced lower annual burden estimates for the period covered by the ICR renewal. For this ICR renewal, the average number of schools in the 3 years of the ICR renewal period are used with the unit burden estimates to derive an annual burden estimate. There is also some increase attributable to using slightly higher numbers of respondents for training providers and states/ territories. The change in burden represents 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: March 11, 2004.

Susan B. Hazen,

Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances. [FR Doc. 04–6217 Filed 3–18–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–8

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6649-5]

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 04, 2003 (68 FR 16511).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–BLM–A65174–00 Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—Proposed Revision to Grazing Regulations for the Public Lands, 42 CFR Part 4100, In the Western Portion of the United States.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with potential adverse impacts to water quality and quantity, riparian habitat and related wildlife and vegetation.

EPA requested that the final EISs provide data to support predicted impacts to these resources. The final EIS should also include specific implementation information on how BLM will conduct the proposed new monitoring, assessments, and documentation.

ERP No. D–BLM–L65432–OR Rating EC2, Upper Siuslaw Late-Successional Reserve Restoration Plan, To Protect and Enhance Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Ecosystems, Eugene District Resource Management Plan, Northwest Forest Plan, Coast Range Mountains, Lane and Douglas Counties, OR.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns and recommends that the FEIS include a full comparison and analyses of all the alternative, including adequate baseline data and disclosure of potential adverse impacts on surface water quality and late successional forests.

ERP No. D–BLM–L65438–OR Rating EC2, Andrews Management Unit/Steens Mountain Cooperative, Cooperative Management and Protection Area, Resource Management Plan, Implementation, Harney and Malheur Counties, OR.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns with adverse impacts to water quality from grazing and mining. The FEIS should fully discuss cumulative impacts from mining and grazing and compare the environmental impacts of alternatives. The FEIS should also include detailed mitigation measures to protect aquatic resources.

ERP No. D–COE–E09810–MS Rating LO, Enhanced Evaluation of Cumulative Effects Associated with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Permitting Activity for Large-Scale Development in Coastal Mississippi, Mississippi, Hancock, Harrison and Jackson Counties, MS.

Summary: While EPA has no objections to the proposed project, EPA did request clarification on the recreation and parking improvements proposed as part of the project.

ERP No. D-COE-L01009-ID Rating EC2, Emerald Creek Garnet Project, Proposal to Mine Garnet Reserves within the St. Maries River Floodplain near Fernwood, Walla Walla District, Issuance of Several Permits, Benewah and Shoshone Counties, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns over the potential impacts of mining proposals on water quality. EPA recommends that adequate mitigation and reclamation be implemented to move the St. Maries River towards its designated beneficial uses. EPA also expressed concern over alternatives that do not avoid ecologically valuable oxbow complexes and recommended that if an alternative is selected that does not avoid oxbows, additional mitigation measures be implemented to ensure the long-term protection and restoration of wetland functions.

ERP No. D–USA–K11111–HI Rating EC2, Transformation of the 2nd Brigade, 25th Infantry Division (Light) to a Stryker Brigade Combat Team in Hawaii, Implementation, Honolulu and Hawaii Counties, HI.

Summary: EPA raised concerns that the project exceeds the Federal Air Quality Standard for particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (fugitive dust) from training operations. Although the DEIS offers mitigation for fugitive dust emissions, it does not quantify reductions expected from controls nor a commitment to implement such mitigation. The Final EIS should evaluate the feasibility of monitoring at sites where the Federal standard is exceeded, and adopting additional mitigation if needed. EPA raised concerns that increased fugitive dust levels may have a disproportionately high adverse effect on low-income or minority populations when transported offsite.

ERP No. DS-COE-C39016-PR Rating EO2, Port of the Americas Project, Additional Information on the Development of a Deep-Draft Terminal at the Port of Ponce to Receive Post-

Panamax Ships, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Municipalities of Guyanilla-Penuelas and Ponce, Puerto Rico.

Summary: EPA believes that the permit applicant failed to adequately document compliance with the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, and until further information is received, that the proposed discharges of fill material would have a substantial and unacceptable impact on aquatic resources of national importance. EPA recommended denial of the permit application for the project as currently proposed.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–FHW–J40158–MT I–15 Corridor Project, Transportation Improvements from Montana City to the Lincoln Road Interchange, Funding and U.S. Army COE Section 404 Permit Issuance, Jefferson and Lewis & Clark Counties, MT.

Summary: EPA has no objections to the preferred alternative.

ERP No. F-NOA-K91010-00 US West Coast Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan (FMP), Approval and Implementation, Ocean Waters off the States of Washington, Oregon and California a portion of the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), WA, OR and CA.

Summary: EPA continues to express concerns regarding bycatch and research actions needed to address information gaps.

Dated: March 15, 2004.

Ken Mittelholtz.

Environmental Protection Specialist, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 04–6219 Filed 3–18–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6649-4]

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 March 8, 2004 Through March 12, 2004

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 040109, Draft EIS, FHW, NE, MO, US-159 Missouri River Crossing Project, Rehabilitate or Replace the Missouri River Bridge at Rulo, Funding and U.S. Army COE Section 404 Permit, Richardson County, NE and Holt County, MO, Comment Period Ends: May 3, 2004, Contact: Ed Kosola (402) 437–5973.

EIS No. 040110, Final EIS, AFS, UT,
North Rich Cattle Allotment, Proposes
to Authorize Grazing,
Implementation, Logan District,
Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Cache
and Rich Counties, UT, Wait Period
Ends: April 19, 2004, Contact: Evelyn
Sibbernsen (435) 755–3620. This
document is available on the Internet
at: http://www.fs.fed.us/r4/wcnf/
projects/proposed/index.shtm1

EIS No. 040111, Final EIS, AFS, WY,
Lost Cabin Mine Project,
Improvement of Historic Mining Road
(Way 4170H) to Allow Motorized
Access to the Lost Mine for Mineral
Exploration, Plan-of-Operations,
Medicine-Bow Routt National Forests
and Thunder Basin National
Grassland, Carbon County, WY, Wait
Period Ends: April 19, 2004, Contact:
Terry Delay (307) 326–2518. This
document is available on the Internet
at: http://www.r7.fws.gov/planning

EIS No. 040112, Draft EIS, FHW, IN, US-231 Highway Project, Improvements from I-64 and Extends to State Road 56 in Haysville, Funding, NPDES Permit and U.S. Army COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Dubois County, IN, Comment Period Ends: May 3, 2004, Contact: Anthony DeSimone (317) 226-5307.

EIS No. 040113, Final EIS, AFS, AL,
Forest Health and Red-Cockaded
Woodpecker (RCW) Initiative,
Implementation, Talladega National
Forest, Talladega and Shoal Creek
Ranger Districts, Calhoun, Cherokee,
Clay, Clebourne and Talladega
Counties, AL, Wait Period Ends: April
19, 2004, Contact: Suzanne Alverson
(256) 362–2909.

EIS No. 040114, Draft EIS, NPS, TX, Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River General Management Plan, Implementation, Big Bend National Park, Brewster and Terrell Counties, TX, Comment Period Ends: May 18, 2004, Contact: Matthew Safford (303) 969–2898.

EIS No. 040115, Final EIS, CGD, WA,
Seattle Monorail Project (SMP), Green
Line 14-Mile Monorail Transit System
Construction and Operation,
Reviewing a Water Crossing at the
Lake Washington Ship Canal Bridge
and Duwamish Waterway Bridge
Modification, USCG Bridge,
Endangered Species Act Section 7 and
U.S. Army COE Section 404 Permits
Issuance, City of Seattle, WA, Wait
Period Ends: April 19, 2004, Contact:
Austin Pratt (206) 220–7282. This