

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE****Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers****Notice of Availability for the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed San Luis Obispo Creek Watershed Waterway Management Plan in the City and County of San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District (Regulatory Branch), in coordination with the San Luis Obispo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District (Zone 9) (District) and the City of San Luis Obispo, has completed a Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (FEIS/EIR) for the San Luis Obispo Creek Watershed Waterway Management Plan. The District and City require authorization pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for activities anticipated necessary to implement a long-term stream maintenance and management program to address regional flooding and flood control along San Luis Obispo Creek and its tributaries. Historically, project planning for activities and development within and affecting the stream corridor has been managed or guided by the policies of various different agencies with no concerted effort at consistent management techniques. The Waterway Management Plan, the Stream Maintenance and Management Plan and the Drainage Design Manual, collectively referred to as the Program, represent a consolidated effort to provide a consistent management program for the waterway and its watershed.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Questions or comments concerning the Final EIS/EIR should be directed to Mr. Bruce Henderson, Senior Project Manager, North Coast Section, Regulatory Branch, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2151 Alessandro Drive, Suite 110, Ventura CA, 93001, (805) 585-2145.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** None.

Dated: December 21, 2006.

**David J. Castanon,**  
Chief, Regulatory Branch, Los Angeles District.

[FR Doc. E6-22599 Filed 1-4-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE** 3710-KF-P

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION****Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests**

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Correction notice.

**SUMMARY:** On December 19, 2006, the Department of Education published a notice in the **Federal Register** (Page 75952, Column 3) for the information collection, "Impact Evaluation of Upward Bound's Increased Focus on Higher-Risk Students—Baseline Data Collection Protocols". This notice hereby corrects the number of responses to 10,890.

The Acting Leader, Information Policy and Standards Team, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management, hereby issues a correction notice as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

Dated: December 28, 2006.

**James Hyler,**

*Acting Leader, Information Policy and Standards Team, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management.*  
[FR Doc. E6-22610 Filed 1-4-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE** 4000-01-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[CA-06-01; FRL-8265-9]

**Notice of Prevention of Significant Deterioration Final Determination for Knauf Insulation, GmbH, Shasta Lake, CA**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA").

**ACTION:** Notice of final action.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces that on November 14, 2006, the Environmental Appeals Board ("EAB") of EPA denied review of all petitions for review of a Prevention of Significant Deterioration ("PSD") permit ("Permit") that EPA Region 9 issued to Knauf Insulation, GmbH ("Knauf"). The Permit was issued pursuant to the PSD regulations under 40 CFR 52.21.

**DATES:** The effective date of the EAB's decision, and the Permit, is November 14, 2006. Pursuant to Section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), 42 U.S.C. 7607(b)(1), judicial review of this permit decision, to the extent it is available, may be sought by filing a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit within 60 days of January 5, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** The relevant documents for the Permit are available for public

inspection during normal business hours at the following address: EPA Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105. To arrange viewing of these documents, contact Shaheerah Kelly at (415) 947-4156 or [kelly.shaheerah@epa.gov](mailto:kelly.shaheerah@epa.gov). The Permit is also available at <http://www.epa.gov/region09/air/permit/knauf>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Shaheerah Kelly, EPA, Region 9, Air Division (AIR-3), 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document, "we," "us" and "our" refer to EPA.

I. What Action Is EPA Taking?

II. What Is the Background Information?

III. What Did the EAB Decide?

**I. What Action Is EPA Taking?**

We are notifying the public of a final decision by the EAB on the Permit issued by EPA Region 9 pursuant to the PSD regulations found at 40 CFR 52.21.

**II. What Is the Background Information?**

Knauf is an existing fiberglass manufacturing facility located in Shasta Lake, Shasta County, California. The Shasta County Air Quality Management District ("AQMD") issued Knauf's PSD permit on March 22, 2000 authorizing construction of the facility. The facility has been in operation since 2002.

In March 2003, EPA rescinded the PSD delegation for many California air pollution permitting agencies, including the Shasta County AQMD which is the air pollution permitting agency in Shasta County. Based on this action and since the Shasta County AQMD did not subsequently request PSD delegation, EPA is currently the PSD permitting authority within Shasta County, California.

Knauf submitted a PSD application to EPA Region 9 to revise the facility's Permit. After consideration of the PSD application, EPA Region 9 issued the draft revised Permit on January 31, 2006, for public review and comment. On May 11, 2006, after providing an opportunity for public comment and a public hearing, EPA issued the revised Permit. The revised Permit changed Knauf's previous Permit by (1) establishing nitrogen oxide ("NO<sub>x</sub>") emission limitations of 16.5 pounds per hour ("lb/hr") and 1.76 pounds per ton of glass pulled ("lb/ton") at the manufacturing line main stack, and (2) changing particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter ("PM<sub>10</sub>") emission limitations to 28.4 lb/hr and 3.03 lb/ton of at the manufacturing line main stack, and 0.67 lb/hr and 0.07 lb/ton at the

glass melting furnace stack. The revised Permit also included other changes related to the changes in the emission limitations.

Subsequent to the issuance of the revised Permit, the EAB received six petitions requesting review of the revised Permit. The EAB denied review of all six petitions.

### III. What Did the EAB Decide?

Four of the petitions raised public health concerns and general concerns about the Knauf facility which were already addressed in EPA Region 9's response to comments for the revised Permit. The EAB denied review of these petitions because they failed to demonstrate why EPA Region 9's response was clearly erroneous or otherwise warranted review. For one of these petitions, which asserted that the original permit issued in 2000 violated the CAA by allowing the facility to be built, the EAB ruled that the assertion did not relate to any condition of the revised Permit issued by EPA Region 9 and was, therefore, beyond the scope of the EAB proceeding.

One petition related to two documents filed with the EAB titled "Notice of Appeal" and "Request for Time Extension." The Notice of Appeal asked for permission to file an appeal with the EAB, but did not raise any specific objections to the revised Permit, and the Extension Request stated only that the petitioners were waiting to receive certain information from EPA Region 9. The EAB denied review because the petitioners did not articulate any specific objections to the revised Permit and did not establish good cause for extending the time to file an appeal.

One petition objected to the location of the Knauf facility and asked for reconsideration of the permitting decision. The EAB denied review since the petitioner did not file the petition in a timely manner and did not participate in the permitting process during the public comment period for the draft revised Permit.

Readers interested in more detail on the appeal issues raised by the petitioners and the reasons for the EAB's denial of review may download EAB's Order Denying Review from the EAB Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/eab>.

Pursuant to 40 CFR 124.19(f)(1), for purposes of judicial review, final agency action occurs when a final PSD permit is issued and agency review procedures are exhausted. This notice is being published pursuant to 40 CFR 124.19(f)(2), which requires notice of any final agency action regarding a PSD

permit to be published in the **Federal Register**. This notice constitutes notice of the final agency action denying review of the revised Permit and, consequently, notice of the EPA Region 9's issuance of the Permit (PSD Permit No. Permit No. NSR 4-4-4, SAC 03-01) to Knauf. If available, judicial review of these determinations under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA may be sought only by the filing of a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, within 60 days from the date on which this notice is published in the **Federal Register**. Under section 307(b)(2) of the CAA, this determination shall not be subject to later judicial review in any civil or criminal proceedings for enforcement.

Dated: December 20, 2006.

**Kerry J. Drake,**

*Acting Director, Air Division, Region 9.*

[FR Doc. E6-22561 Filed 1-4-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FR1-6682-8]

### 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 7, 2006 (71 FR 17845).

#### Draft EISs

*EIS No. 20060373, ERP No. D-BLM-K65319-CA, Sierra Resource Management Plan, Provide Direction for Managing Public Lands, Several Counties, CA.*

*Summary:* EPA expressed environmental concern about impacts to water quality and aquatic habitat, and to public health from exposure to naturally occurring asbestos. Rating EC2.

*EIS No. 20060418, ERP No. D-FHW-L40231-WA, East Lake Sammamish Master Plan Trail, Design and Construct an Alternative Non-Motorized Transportation and Multi-Use Recreational Trail, Funding and U.S. Army COE Section 404 Permit, King County, WA.*

*Summary:* EPA does not object to the proposed project. EPA does recommend

including additional information in the EIS regarding BMPs, a vegetation management plan, and water quality monitoring. Rating LO.

#### Final EISs

*EIS No. 20060468, ERP No. F-NPS-K61159-CA, Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, General Management Plan, Middle and South Forks of the Kings River and North Forks of the Kern River, General Management Plan, Tulare and Fresno Counties, CA.*

*Summary:* EPA does not object to this project.

*EIS No. 20060473, ERP No. F-FHW-H40189-MO, Interstate 29/35 Paseo Bridge Corridor, Reconstruct and Widen I-29/35, Missouri River, North Kansas City and Kansas City, Clay and Jackson Counties, MO.*

*Summary:* EPA does not object to the proposed project. EPA does recommend that additional information be obtained about populations within the project area potentially sensitive to mobile source air toxics.

*EIS No. 20060483, ERP No. F-UAF-K11021-GU, Andersen Air Force Base (AFB), Establish and Operate an Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance, and Strike (ISR/Strike) Capability, Guam.*

*Summary:* EPA continues to have concerns about cumulative environmental impacts and direct impacts to endangered species.

*EIS No. 20060484, ERP No. F-NAS-A12042-00, Mars Science Laboratory Mission (MSL), To Conduct Comprehensive Science on the Surface of Mars and Demonstrate Technological Advancements in the Exploration of Mars, Using a Radioisotope Power Source in 2009 from Cape Canaveral Air Force Station, FL.*

*Summary:* EPA does not object to the proposed action.

Dated: December 29, 2006.

**Clifford Rader,**

*Environmental Protection Specialist, Office of Federal Activities.*

[FR Doc. E6-22618 Filed 1-4-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**