

It is important to note that EPA's policy is that public comments, whether submitted electronically or in paper, will be made available for public viewing in EPA's electronic public docket as EPA receives them and without change, unless the comment contains copyrighted material, CBI, or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information claimed as CBI and other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute is not included in the official public docket or in EPA's electronic public docket. EPA's policy is that copyrighted material, including copyrighted material contained in a public comment, will not be placed in EPA's electronic public docket but will be available only in printed, paper form in the official public docket. Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the EPA Docket Center.

B. How and To Whom Do I Submit Comments?

You may submit comments as provided in the **ADDRESSES** section. Please ensure that your comments are submitted within the specified comment period. Comments received after the close of the comment period will be marked "late." EPA is not required to consider these late comments.

If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name, mailing address, and an e-mail address or other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD-ROM you submit. This ensures that you can be identified as the submitter of the comment and allows EPA to contact you in case EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties or needs further information on the substance of your comment. Any identifying or contact information provided in the body of a comment will be included as part of the comment that is placed in the official public docket, and made available in EPA's electronic public docket. 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.

Your use of EPA's electronic public docket to submit comments to EPA electronically is EPA's preferred method for receiving comments. The electronic public docket system is an "anonymous access" system, which means EPA will not know your identity, e-mail address, or other contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. In contrast to EPA's electronic public docket, EPA's electronic mail (e-mail) system is not an "anonymous access" system. If you send an e-mail comment directly to the Docket without going through EPA's electronic public docket, your e-mail address is automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the official public docket, and made available in EPA's electronic public docket.

Dated: July 15, 2004.

Lisa K. Friedman,

Associate General Counsel, Air and Radiation Law Office, Office of General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 04-16833 Filed 7-22-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[R04-OAR-2004-NC-0002-200422; FRL-7791-6]

Adequacy Status of the Raleigh/Durham and Greensboro/Winston-Salem/High Point, NC 1-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Updates for Transportation Conformity Purposes

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of adequacy.

SUMMARY: In this notice, EPA is notifying the public that EPA has found that the motor vehicle emission budgets (MVEB) in the Raleigh/Durham area (Durham and Wake Counties and a portion of Granville County) and Greensboro/Winston-Salem/High Point area (Davidson, Forsyth, and Guilford Counties, and a portion of Davie County) 1-hour ozone maintenance plan updates, submitted June 4, 2004, by the North Carolina Department of

Environment and Natural Resources (NCDENR), are adequate for transportation conformity purposes. On March 2, 1999, the DC Circuit Court ruled that submitted State Implementation Plans (SIPs) cannot be used for transportation conformity determinations until EPA has affirmatively found them adequate. As a result of EPA's finding, the Raleigh/Durham and Greensboro/Winston-Salem/High Point areas can use the MVEB from the submitted Raleigh/Durham area and Greensboro/Winston-Salem/High Point area 1-hour ozone maintenance plan updates, respectively, for future conformity determinations.

DATES: These MVEB are effective August 9, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matt Laurita, Environmental Engineer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, Air Planning Branch, Air Quality Modeling and Transportation Section, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303. Mr. Laurita can also be reached by telephone at (404) 562-9044, or via electronic mail at laurita.matthew@epa.gov. The finding is available at EPA's conformity Web site: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/transp.htm> (once there, click on the "Transportation Conformity" text icon, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions").

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Today's notice is simply an announcement of a finding that EPA has already made. EPA Region 4 sent a letter to NCDENR on June 23, 2004, stating that the MVEB in the submitted Raleigh/Durham area and Greensboro/Winston-Salem/High Point area 1-hour ozone maintenance plan updates submitted on June 4, 2004, are adequate. This finding has also been announced on EPA's conformity Web site: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/transp.htm>, (once there, click on the "Transportation Conformity" text icon, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions"). The adequate MVEB are provided in the following table.

RALEIGH/DURHAM AREA MVEB

[Tons per day]

County	Pollutant	2007	2010	2012	2015
Durham	VOC	8.30	6.77	5.94	5.26
	NO _x	15.29	11.35	9.09	6.49
Granville*	VOC	0.55	0.46	0.41	0.37
	NO _x	1.46	1.13	0.89	0.62
Wake	VOC	20.04	17.36	15.64	14.35

RALEIGH/DURHAM AREA MVEB—Continued
[Tons per day]

County	Pollutant	2007	2010	2012	2015
	NO _x	41.38	29.90	24.41	17.90

*Partial County.

GREENSBORO/WINSTON-SALEM/HIGH POINT AREA MVEB
[Tons per day]

County	Pollutant	2007	2010	2012	2015
Davidson	VOC	5.77	4.73	4.38	3.94
	NO _x	10.49	7.79	6.36	4.72
Davie*	VOC	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	NO _x	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01
Forsyth	VOC	12.06	9.93	9.12	8.14
	NO _x	19.53	14.49	11.83	8.79
Guilford	VOC	17.55	14.32	13.10	11.66
	NO _x	27.28	20.11	16.44	12.18

*Partial County.

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990. EPA's conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs and projects conform to State air quality implementation plans and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.

The criteria by which EPA determines whether a SIP's MVEB are adequate for transportation conformity purposes are outlined in 40 Code of Federal Regulations 93.118(e)(4). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review, and it also should not be used to prejudice EPA's ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if EPA finds a budget adequate, the Agency may later determine that the SIP itself is not approvable.

EPA has described the process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in guidance (May 14, 1999 memorandum entitled "Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision"). EPA has followed this guidance in making this adequacy determination. This guidance is incorporated into EPA's June 14, 2004, final rulemaking entitled "Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments for the New 8-hour Ozone and PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Miscellaneous Revisions for Existing Areas; Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments: Response to Court Decision and Additional Rule Changes."

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: July 14, 2004.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 04-16832 Filed 7-22-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6653-9]

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 the **Federal Register** dated April 2, 2004 (69 FR 17403).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-BLM-J65413-MT Rating EC2, Dillon Resource Management Plan, Provide Direction for Managing Public Lands within the Dillon Field Office, Implementation, Beaverhead and Madison Counties, MT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding potential impacts to water quality, habitat and on ecosystem processes. EPA believes the final EIS should include additional information to explain how the RMP and actions taken

will provide a complete and consistent guide to managing the area, and assessing and mitigating significant impacts of the action.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-AFS-J65016-UT, Bear Hodges II Timber Sale Management Plan, Selective Timber Harvest of Spruce Stands With or Without Road Construction, Implementation, Wasatch National Forest (WCNF), Logan Ranger District, Cache and Rich Counties, UT.

Summary: The final EIS adequately responded to EPA's previous concerns. Therefore, EPA has no objection to the proposed action.

ERP No. F-AFS-J65406-MT, West Troy Project, Proposes Timber Harvesting, Natural Fuels Reduction Treatments, Pre-Commercial Thinning, and Watershed Rehabilitation (Decommissioning) Work, Kootenai National Forest, Three River Ranger District, Lincoln County, MT.

Summary: While the final EIS addressed many of EPA's previous concerns, EPA continues to express concerns that additional necessary watershed restoration work be completed in light of the large backlog and uncertain funding.

ERP No. F-AFS-L65447-00, East Bridge Cattle Allotment Management Plan Revision (AMP), Authorization of Continued Grazing, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Soda Springs Ranger District, Caribou and Bonneville Counties, ID and Lincoln County, WY.

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

ERP No. F-NPS-J65384-MT, Glacier National Park Commercial Services Plan, General Management Plan, Implementation, Glacier National Park,