roads and trails for OHV access prior to site-specific analysis to identify appropriate use areas.

ERP No. D–BLM–L65339–OR Rating LO, North Bank Habitat Management Area (NBHMA)/Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), Federally Endangered Columbian White-Tailed Deer (CWTD) and Special Status Species Habitat Enhancements to Ensure Viability Over Time, Implementation, OR.

Summary: EPA expressed lack of objections and expects that road restrictions, trail maintenance, camping restrictions and environmental education programs will help improve deer habitat while maintaining recreation opportunities within the area.

ERP No. D–FHW–D40303–PA Rating EC2, Mon/Fayette Transportation Project, Improvements from Uniontown to Brownsville Area, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, Fayette and Washington Counties, PA.

Summary: EPA expressed concern due to potential impacts on cultural/natural resources and residential/commercial properties. EPA requested that the final document provide additional mitigation to avoid/protect aquatic and terrestrial resources.

ERP No. D–NPS–J65319–UT Rating LO, Zion National Park, General Management Plan, Implementation, Washington, Iron and Kane Counties, UT.

Summary: EPA has no objection to the proposed action.

ERP No. DS–FHW–G40145–00 Rating LO, US 71 Highway Improvement Project, Updated Information, between Texarkana, (US71) Arkansas and DeQueen, Texarkana Northern Loop Funding, Right-of-Way Approval and COE Section 404 Permit, Little River, Miller and Sevier Counties, AR and Bowie County, TX.

Summary: EPA's previous review indicated that there was no objection to the preferred alternative. EPA has no objections to the two new alternatives now identified in the document.

ERP No. DS–UAF–E11032–FL Rating EO2, Homestead Air Force Base (AFB) Disposal and Reuse Updated and Additional Information on Disposal of Portions of the Former Homestead (AFB), Implementation, Dade County, FL.

Summary: EPA objects to the proposed action to convert the former HAFB into a commercial regional airport. EPA believes that siting a commercial airport between the Everglades and Biscayne National Parks is inappropriate and strongly recommend an environmentally sensitive mixed use alternative be selected as the preferred alternative. Of the presented alternatives, EPA believes that the Collier Mixed Use Proposal with some modifications and assurances is the environmentally preferred alternative and should be pursued further in the final EIS.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–BLM–G65051–NM New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, Implementation, NM.

Summary: EPA had no objections to the proposed action.

ERP No. F–COE–E39051–FL Lake Okeechobee Regulation Schedule Study, To Maintain or Improve Existing Water Storage, St. Lucie and Caloosahatchee River Estuaries, FL.

Summary: EPA continue to express concern regarding the lack of a comprehensive downstream monitoring program. EPA requested the ROD commit to a monitoring program and that the acquired data be shared with involved state and federal agencies in determining the effects of short-term phosphorous increases on the Everglades Protection Area.

ERP No. F–FHW–F40380–IN IN–641 Terre Haute Bypass, Improve access between US 41 South to I–70 East of Terre Haute, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, Vigo County, In.

Summary: EPA's previous issues were resolved, therefore EPA has no objection to the action as proposed.

ERP No. F–FHW–G50008–00 Great River Bridge, Construction, US 65 in Arkansas to MS–8 in Mississippi, Funding, COE Section 404 Permit and US Coast Guard Bridge Permit, Desha and Arkansas Counties, AR and Bolivar County, MS.

Summary: EPA's previous issues have been resolved, therefore EPA has no objection to the selection of the Southern Alternative as the preferred transportation corridor.

ERP No. F–FHW–J40150–ND Interstate 29 Reconstruction Project, Improvements from Rose Coulee to Cass County Road No. 20, Funding, City of Fargo, ND.

Summary: No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. F–FHW–K40193–CA I–215 Improvements, Orange Show Road to CA–30, Funding, City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed continued concern that cumulative impacts were not fully addressed. EPA requested that additional comments on air and water quality mitigation, solid waste, pollution prevention, and cumulative impacts be addressed in the Record of Decision.

ERP No. F–FRC–J05079–00 Cabinet Gorge (No. 2058–014) and Noxon Rapids (No. 2075–014) Hydroelectric Project, Relicensing, MT and ID.

Summary: EPA recommended that FERC include a minimum flow release from Noxon Rapids Dam to reduce the magnitude of flow, velocity, and depth fluctuations in the river channel below Noxon Rapids Dam. EPA also recommended that the recommended measures, terms and conditions of the US Fish and Wildlife Service to minimize an incidental take of the bull trout be included as FERC license conditions.

ERP No. F–NPS–D61051–VA Booker T. Washington National Monument (BOWA), General Management Plan, Implementation, Franklin County, VA.

Summary: EPA's previous issues have been adequately addressed, therefore EPA no objection to the action as proposed.

ERP No. F–UAF–G11038–00 Realistic Bomber Training Initiative, Improve the B–52 and B–1 Aircrews Mission Training and Maximize Combat Training Time, Barksdale Air Force Base, LA, NM and TX.

Summary: EPA has no objection to the action as proposed.

ERP No. F–USN–K11099–NV Fallon Naval Air Station (NAS), Proposal for the Fallon Range Complex Requirements, Federal and Private Lands, Churchill, Eureka, Lander, Mineral, Nye and Washoe Counties, NV.

Summary: No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

Dated: March 14, 2000.

B. Katherine Biggs,

Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 00–6707 Filed 3–16–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6252–3]

Peace River Intake Facility, DeSoto County, Florida Construction and Operation of Expanded Water Treatment and Aquifer Storage/Recovery Facilities: Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on facility construction associated with the Peace River/Manasota Regional

Water Supply Authority Facility Construction Grant.

PURPOSE: Pursuant to 40 CFR 1501.7 and in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), EPA has identified the need to prepare an EIS and therefore issues this Notice of Intent pursuant to 40 CFR 1507.7.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION AND TO BE PLACED ON THE PROJECT MAILING LIST CONTACT: Ms Lena Scott, Environmental Protection Agency—Region 4, Office of Environmental Assessment, 61 Forsyth Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30303, Telephone: (404) 562-9607 or FAX (404) 562–9598.

SUMMARY: EPA intends to prepare the EIS to evaluate the impacts of the Peace River/Manasota Regional Water Supply Authority's (Authority) proposal to construct and operate expanded water treatment and aquifer storage/recovery facilities at its existing Peace River Facility located in southwest DeSoto County, Florida. The proposed facilities will include treatment of surface water, alternative water storage including off-stream aquifer storage and recovery wells, and expansion of regional pipeline connections. EPA intends to retain the services of an independent contractor to provide technical data and to prepare the EIS using the ''third party method'' as provided under 40 CFR 6.510(b)(3). By utilizing the third party method, EPA enters into an agreement for the Authority to engage and pay for the services of a contractor to prepare the EIS under the direction of EPA.

NEED FOR ACTION: EPA awarded construction grants totaling $9,574,000 to the Authority for the construction of water treatment and aquifer storage/recovery facilities. Based on draft Environmental Information Documents (EID) submitted by the Authority, EPA determined the EID did not adequately address potential impacts and could not issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). Known concerns include impacts from reduced flows on the Peace River, long-term impacts to Charlotte Harbor, threatened and endangered species, salinity regime change impacts on aquatic organisms, sport and commercial fisheries, cumulative and secondary impacts.

ALTERNATIVES:

- EPA issues construction grant with conditions.
- EPA issues construction grant with no conditions.
- EPA withholds construction grant, the No Action Alternative.

SCOPING: EPA will hold a public scoping meeting in April in which a general description of the projects and its goals will be presented. Time and meeting location will be announced in newspapers local to the project. Details of the proposed project will be presented. Both oral and written comments will be accepted at the scoping meeting to assist EPA to determine the scope of the EIS. Persons who do not attend the meeting and wish to comment on the issues and scope of the project are invited to respond in writing to this agency within 30 days of the scoping meeting.

ESTIMATED DATE OF DEIS RELEASE: September 1, 2001.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: A. Stanley Meiburg, Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 4, Environmental Protection Agency.

Dated: March 3, 2000.

Anne N. Miller,

Deptuy Director, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 00–6705 Filed 3–16–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission, Comments Requested

March 10, 2000.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before May 16, 2000. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments to Les Smith, Federal Communications Commissions, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room 1–A804, Washington, DC 20554 or via the Internet to lesmith@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collections contact Les Smith at (202) 418–0217 or via the Internet at lesmith@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060–0752.

Title: Billing Disclosure Requirements for Pay-Per Call and Other Information Services, 47 CFR 64.1510.

Form Number: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension.

Respondents: Business or other for profit.

Number of Respondents: 1350.

Estimated Time Per Response: 40 Hours.

Total Annual Burden: 54,000 Hours.

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Cost Burden: $0.

Frequency of Response: On occasion; Third Party Disclosure.

Needs and Uses: Pursuant to Section 64.1510, telephone bills containing charges for interstate pay-per-call and other information services must include information detailing consumers' rights and responsibilities with respect to these charges. Specifically, telephone bills carrying pay-per-call charges must include a consumer notification stating that (1) the charges are for non-communications services; (2) local and long distance telephone services may not be disconnected for failure to pay pay-per-call charges; (3) pay per call (900 number) blocking is available upon request; and (4) access to pay-per-call services may be involuntarily blocked for failure to pay pay-per-call charges. In addition, each call billed must show the type of service, the amount of the charge, and the date, time, and duration of the call. Finally, the bill must display a toll-free number which subscribers may call to obtain information about pay-per-call services. Similar billing disclosure requirements apply to charges for information services either billed to subscribers on a collect basis or accessed by subscribers through a toll-free number. The billing disclosure contained in Section 64.1510 are intended to ensure that telephone subscribers billed for pay-per-call or