which elements of the BAQ guidance have been incorporated into building management practices throughout the United States. The Agency also wishes to determine what barriers to implementation, if any, have been incurred by building owners and managers. These data are essential for measuring the effectiveness of EPA's efforts to encourage good IAQ management practices in large office buildings against the Agency's established Government Performance and Results Act or 1993 (GPRA) goal. By the year 2005, EPA wishes to demonstrate a five-percent increase in the number of large office buildings (i.e., over 50,000 square feet) that use good IAQ management practices.

To determine its success in achieving this goal, EPA intends to survey owners and managers of commercial and Federally-owned office buildings greater than 50,000 square feet on a variety of IAQ practices. The Agency will mail a survey and instructions for completing it to approximately 4,150 building owners and managers. Building owners/ managers will be given up to 30 days to respond. At the end of this period, a follow-up letter will be sent to building owners/ managers to remind them of the survey and to encourage them to respond. The initial survey will establish a baseline for the use rate of IAQ-related practices recommended in EPA's guidance. After its completion, EPA will continue efforts to encourage large office building owners and managers to adopt the IAQ practices outlined in BAQ. EPA intends to conduct another survey in 2005 to assess changes in the use of these practices.

EPA does not expect to receive confidential information from the building owners and managers voluntarily participating in the IAQ Practices in Large Buildings Survey. However, if a respondent does consider the information submitted to be of a proprietary nature, EPA will assure its confidentiality based on the provisions of 40 CFR Part 2, Subpart B, "Confidentiality of Business Information."

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. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR Part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter

The EPA would like to solicit comments 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.

(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: EPA expects to mail surveys to approximately 4,150 building owners and managers. EPA expects approximately 43 percent of those surveyed to respond to this information collection request. Over three years, EPA estimates that the burden to building owners and managers who respond to the survey will be approximately 3,233 hours. 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.

This survey effort is expected to cost the respondents approximately \$67,890. Respondents will incur no capital or start-up costs and the only operation and maintenance component of the survey will be the cost to photocopy the survey once completed (if desired). Burden and cost estimates for the future administration of the IAQ Practices in Large Buildings Survey will be provided at the time this ICR is renewed, but they are expected to be similar to those provided in this **Federal Register** notice.

Dated: January 21, 2000.

Mary T. Smith,

Director, Indoor Environments Division. [FR Doc. 00–2481 Filed 2–3–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6250-8]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared January 17, 2000 Through January 21, 2000 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 09, 1999 (63 FR 17856).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–COE–E32079–SC Rating EO2, Daniel Island Marine Cargo Terminal Development, Permits and Approvals, South Caroline State PortsAuthority, (SCSPA), Charleston, Berkeley County, SC.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections due to significant indirect and induced impacts related to wetlands, environmental justice, waste treatment, air quality, dredge material disposal and discharge permit issues. EPA requested additional information and mitigation measures.

ERP No. D—COE—E39049—FL Rating EC2, Southwest Florida Improvement to the RegulatoryProcess for Rapid Growth and Development,Alternatives Development Group (ADG), Lee and Collier Counties, FL.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about finalizing this regulatory process given its scope/complexity. Additional information about future development trends will need to be evaluated in the context of an improved review process to avoid unacceptable losses to the natural environment.

ERP No. D–FAA–G51015–TX Rating EC2, George Bush Intercontinental Airport Houston, Construction and Operation, Runway 8L–26R and Associated Near Term Master Plan Project, City of Houston, Harris County, TX.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns due to potential noise and air related impacts. The FEIS should clarify and demonstrate air conformity requirements including implication to the State Implementation Plan and mitigation measures should be included in the ROD.

ERP No. D-FHW-E40781-FL Rating EC2, FL-423 (John Young Parking), Improvements from FL-50 to Fl-434, City of Orlando, Orange County,FL.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concern regarding relocation issues and potential noise impacts. EPA requested additional consideration of residential relocations and noise mitigation. EPA also suggested that the project design provide for future light rail and bike lanes.

ERP No. D–SFW–K99029–CA Rating EC2, San Joaquin County Multi-Species HabitatConservation and Open Space Plan, Issuance of Incidental Take Permit, San Joaquin County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about compliance with EPA's CWA Section 404(b)(1) guidelines. TheFinal EIS should clearly reflect the requirements to avoid and minimize, to the fullest extent practicable, the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States.

ERP No. D-USN-E11047-00 Rating EC1, USS Winston S. Churchill (DDG 81), Conducting a Shock Trial, Offshore of Naval Stations, Mayport, FL; Norfolk, VA and/or Pascagoula, MS.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the proposed ship shock test, and recommended post-monitoring results be made available to assess mitigation measures.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–COE–G39031–ARGrand Prairie Area Demonstration Project,Implementation, Water Conservation, GroundwaterManagement and Irrigation Water Supply,Prairie, Arkansas, Monroe and Lonoke Counties, AR.

Summary: EPA continued to express concerns about the project and urged the Corps to conduct a comprehensive, or cumulative impact study of the White River basin in order to gain a better understanding of the interaction of implemented and planned projects.

ÉRP No. F–FAA–C51019–NÝ LaGuardia Airport East End Roadway Improvements Project, Four New Ramps at the 102nd Street Bridge Construction, Airport Layout Plan Approval and Funding, Queens County, NY.

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

ERP No. F–USN–K11104–CA Marine Corp Air Station (MCAS) Tustin Disposal and Reuse Plan, Cities of Tustin and Irvine, Orange County, CA.

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

ERP No. FS-UAF-C11011-NY Griffiss Air Force Base (AFB) Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Oneida County, NY.

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

Dated: February 1, 2000.

B. Katherine Biggs,

Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities. [FR Doc. 00–2594 Filed 2–3–00; 8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6250-7]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 OR www.epa.gov/oeca/ofa Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed January 24, 2000 Through January 28, 2000 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 000020, Final EIS, COE, FL, Lake Okeechobee Regulation Schedule Study, To Maintain or Improve Existing Water Storage, St. Lucie and Caloosahatchee River Estuaries, FL, Due: March 6, 2000, Contact: Elmar Kurzbach (904) 232–2325.

EIS No. 000021, Final EIS, USN, 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, Due: March 6, 2000, Contact: Terri Knutson (775) 885–6156.

EIS No. 000022, Final EIS, DOE, NM, The Conveyance and Transfer of Certain Land Tracts Administered by the US DOE and Located at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos and Santa Fe Counties, NM, Due: March 6, 2000, Contact: Elizabeth Withers (505) 667–8690.

EIS No. 000023, Draft EIS, SFW, CA, San Diequito Wetland Restoration Project, Implementation, Comprehensive Restoration Plan, COE Section 404 Permit, Cities of Del Mar and San Diego, San Diego County, CA, Due: March 20, 2000, Contact: Jack Fancher (760) 431–9440.

EIS No. 000024, Draft EIS, FHW, TX, TX–130 Construction, I–35 of Georgetown to I–10 near Seguin, Funding, COE Section 404 Permit, Williamson, Travis, Caldwell, Guadalupe Counties, TX, Due: March 20, 2000, Contact: Walter Waidelich (512) 916–5988.

EIS No. 000025, Final EIS, FHW, AR, MS, AR, 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, Due: March 6, 2000, Contact: Elizabeth A. Romero (504) 324–5625.

EIS No. 000026, Final EIS, UAF, LA, TX, NM, 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, Due: March 6, 2000, Contact: Brenda Cook (757) 764–9339.

EIS No. 000027, Final EIS, FRC, FL, MS, Florida Gas Transmission Phase IV Expansion Project (Docket No. CP99–94–000), To Deliver Natural Gas to Electric Generator, FL and MS, Due: March 6, 2000, Contact: Paul McKee (202) 208–1088.

Dated: February 1, 2000.

B. Katherine Biggs,

Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities. [FR Doc. 00–2595 Filed 2–3–00; 8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6533-6]

Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board; Meeting Dates and Agenda

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, as amended (5 U.S.C., App 2) notification is hereby given of an open meeting of the Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board (ELAB).

DATES: The meeting will be held on February 15, 2000, from 1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

ADDRESSES: While the meeting will be conducted by teleconference, the public is invited to participate by joining David Friedman in EPA Conference Room 2 on the fourth floor of the Ronald Reagan Building, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Among the items the Board will discuss are updates from its subcommittees, laboratory performance testing, shipment of environmental samples, and any public comments that the Board has received since their December 1999 meeting.