

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 12, 2002, (67 FR 11992).

#### Draft EISs

*ERP No. D-DOE-L05224-WA Rating LO*, Maiden Wind Farm Project, Proposes to Construct and Operate up to 494 megawatts (MW) Wind Generation on Privately- and Publicly-owned Property, Conditional Use Permits, Benton and Yakima Counties, WA.

*Summary:* EPA has no significant concerns with the project.

*ERP No. D-FHW-F40404-MN Rating EO2*, Trunk Highway (TH) 53 Project, Transportation Improvements, from 1.2 km (¾ mile) South of St. Louis County Road 307 to the South City Limits of Cook, NPDES Permit, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, St. Louis County, MN.

*Summary:* EPA expressed environmental objections regarding the magnitude of wetland impacts, lack of a detailed wetland mitigation plan, impacts to U.S. Forest Service land, and possible forest fragmentation and wildlife habitat issues. EPA requested that additional information on wetland mitigation, forest fragmentation and wildlife habitat impacts be developed and taken into consideration when identifying a preferred alternative.

*ERP No. D-FHW-H40403-KS Rating EC2*, US 59 Highway Construction Improvements, Lawrence to Ottawa, Funding, NPDES Permit Issuance and Possible US Army COE Permit Issuance, Douglas and Franklin Counties, KS.

*Summary:* EPA expressed environmental concerns with the degree of information provided on cultural resources, noise impacts, and endangered species. EPA requested that appropriate mitigation measures be described in more detail for these three project impacts.

*ERP No. D-NPS-D65025-WV Rating LO*, National Coal Heritage Area, Strategic Management Action Plan, Implementation, Boone, Cabal, Layette, Logan, McDowell, Mercer, Mingo, Raleigh, Summers, Wayne and Wyoming Counties, WV.

*Summary:* EPA expressed lack of objections to the preferred alternative.

#### Final EISs

*ERP No. F-AFS-F65029-IL* Midewin National Tallgrass, Proposed Land and Resource Management Plan,

Implementation, Prairie Plan Development, Will County, IL.

*Summary:* EPA has no objection to the action as proposed since the final EIS addressed previous concerns regarding water quality, preserving wetland functions, invasive species, and non-target agricultural practice impacts.

*ERP No. F-BLM-K67052-NV* Newmont Gold Mining, South Operations Area Project Amendment, Operation and Expansion, Plan of Operations, Elko and Eureka Counties, NV.

*Summary:* EPA expressed continuing objections to the proposed project because the existing mine is currently out of compliance with its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) discharge effluent limitations for total dissolved solids (TDS) and possibly other constituents. EPA recommended that BLM not approve the Plan of Operations for the proposed expansion until the mine comes into compliance with its permit. EPA also expressed concerns regarding the acid generating potential of the waste rock, and recommended that BLM include specific commitments in its Record of Decision (ROD) to ensure the appropriate ratio of acid neutralizing waste rock to acid generating waste rock during disposal. EPA recommended that BLM consider additional monitoring and address any long-term bonding needs prior to issuance of the Plan of Operations.

*ERP No. F-MMS-L03010-AK* Liberty Development and Production Plan, Beaufort Sea Oil and Gas Development, Implementation, To Transport and Sell Oil to the U.S. and World Markets, Right-of-Way Application, Offshore Beaufort Sea Marine Environment and Onshore North Slope of Alaska Coastal Plan, AK.

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

*ERP No. F-USA-D11032-PA* Fort Indiantown Gap National Guard Training Center, Training and Operations Enhancement, Pennsylvania National Guard (PANG), Annville, Dauphin and Lebanon Counties, PA.

*Summary:* EPA has no objection to the proposed action since previous issues were adequately addressed within the Final EIS.

Dated: June 18, 2002.

**B. Katherine Biggs,**

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

[FR Doc. 02-15727 Filed 6-20-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7236-3]

### Draft Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by the Environmental Protection Agency

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

**ACTION:** Notice of comment request extension.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has developed Draft Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by the Environmental Protection Agency (Information Quality Guidelines). EPA is extending the comment period regarding its draft Information Quality Guidelines from May 31, 2002 to June 21, 2002.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before June 21, 2002, 11:59 pm EST.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be addressed to: Docket ID No. OEI-10014 which has been established at: U.S. EPA, Northeast Mall, Room B607, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460. See the "Supplementary Information" section for instructions on submitting comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Evangeline Tsibris Cummings, Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Information, Telephone: 202-566-0621; Fax: 202-566-0706; e-mail: cummings.evangelina@epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** EPA has developed draft Information Quality Guidelines, in response to an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guideline directing all Federal agencies to develop and implement their own guidelines by October 1, 2002 (67 FR 8451, February 22, 2002). The draft Information Quality Guidelines are available at the EPA web site, [www.epa.gov/oei/qualityguidelines](http://www.epa.gov/oei/qualityguidelines). Comments may be submitted by web site, e-mail, mail, facsimile, or in person. EPA encourages you to submit your comments electronically to ensure timely receipt. Please visit the EPA web site, [www.epa.gov/oei/qualityguidelines](http://www.epa.gov/oei/qualityguidelines), or the previous notice (67 FR 21234-21235, April 30, 2002) for instructions on how to submit your comments.

Dated: June 14, 2002.

**Mark Luttner,**

Director, Office of Information Collection,  
Office of Environmental Information.

[FR Doc. 02-15724 Filed 6-20-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

### Council on Environmental Quality

#### Proposed Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of information

**AGENCY:** Council on Environmental  
Quality, Executive Office of the  
President.

**ACTION:** Proposed guidelines and  
corrections to comment request.

**SUMMARY:** This notice requests comment  
on proposed guidelines. These proposed  
guidelines were first published in  
**Federal Register** Vol. 67 No. 98 on May  
21, 2002. They were accompanied by a  
request for comments, however, the  
email address listed was incorrect. This  
notice has the correct email address and  
an extended comment period to July 15,  
2002.

These guidelines implement Section  
515 of the Treasury and General  
Government Appropriations Act for  
Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 106-554;  
H.R. 5658). Section 515 directs the  
Office of Management and Budget  
(OMB) to issue government-wide  
guidelines under sections 3504(d)(1)  
and 3516 of Title 44, and require each  
Federal agency to issue agency-specific  
guidelines, to ensure and maximize the  
quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity  
of information, including statistical  
information, disseminated by the agency  
and to establish administrative  
mechanisms allowing affected persons  
to seek and obtain correction of  
information maintained and  
disseminated by the agency that does  
not comply with such guidelines. Each  
agency must also report periodically to  
the OMB director on the number,  
nature, and resolution of complaints  
received by the agency in regards to  
these requirements.

The proposed guidelines published  
below would implement these  
requirements for the Council on  
Environmental Quality. They are  
intended to comply with both the  
statutory requirements noted above and  
the final guidelines published by OMB  
on February 22, 2002 (Vol. 67 **Federal  
Register** No. 36, at 8452).

**DATES:** Public comments must be  
submitted by July 15, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Please submit comments to  
Dinah Bear, General Counsel of the  
Council on Environmental Quality, 722  
Jackson Place, NW., Washington, DC  
20503. Comments can be emailed to  
[info\\_quality@ceq.eop.gov](mailto:info_quality@ceq.eop.gov)

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Dinah Bear, General Counsel, Council  
on Environmental Quality, 722 Jackson  
Place, NW., Washington, DC 20503.  
Telephone: (202) 395-7421.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Notice of  
this action appeared in The Council on  
Environmental Quality (CEQ) was  
established by Congress in 1969 through  
passage of the National Environmental  
Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et  
seq.*, and is an agency within the  
Executive Office of the President (EOP).  
The Chairman of CEQ, who is appointed  
by the President with the advice and  
consent of the Senate, serves as the  
principal environmental policy adviser  
to the President. CEQ coordinates  
federal environmental efforts and works  
closely with agencies and other White  
House offices in the development of  
environmental policies and initiatives.  
CEQ also oversees Federal agencies  
implementation of NEPA through  
promulgation of regulations  
implementing the procedural provisions  
of NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508) and  
through interpretation of statutory  
requirements. CEQ also has a variety of  
other responsibilities under NEPA, the  
Environmental Quality Improvement  
Act of 1970 and other statutes.

Section 515 of the Treasury and  
General Government Appropriations  
Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law  
106-554, hereinafter referred to as  
Section 515) directs the Office of  
Management and Budget to issue  
government-wide guidelines that  
“provide policy and procedural  
guidance to Federal agencies for  
ensuring and maximizing the quality,  
objectivity, utility, and integrity of  
information (including statistical  
information) disseminated by Federal  
agencies.” OMB has required agencies  
to publish draft guidelines no later than  
May 1, 2002. The Council on  
Environmental Quality’s guidelines will  
be published in the **Federal Register**  
and posted on the agency’s web site at  
[www.whitehouse.gov/ceq](http://www.whitehouse.gov/ceq).

The following are CEQ’s “Proposed  
Guidelines for Ensuring and  
Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity,  
Utility, and Integrity of Information  
Disseminated by the Council on  
Environmental Quality”:

A. CEQ will ensure that all  
information it disseminates to the  
public meets all applicable standards of  
quality, including objectivity, utility

and integrity. CEQ hereby adopts this  
standard of quality, as a performance  
goal, and adopts the following  
procedures for the incorporation of  
information quality criteria into CEQ  
information dissemination activities.

1. Objectivity and Utility of  
Information.

As defined in Section C, below,  
“objectivity” is a measure of whether  
disseminated information is “accurate,  
clear, complete, and unbiased;”.

“Utility” refer to the usefulness of the  
information to its intended audience.  
CEQ is committed to disseminating  
reliable and useful information. Before  
disseminating information, CEQ staff  
and officials will ensure that the  
information has been reviewed in an  
information quality review process that  
is proportional to the importance of the  
information. It is the primary  
responsibility of the professional staff  
person drafting information intended for  
dissemination, or supervising the  
preparation of such information, to use  
the most knowledgeable and reliable  
sources reasonably available to confirm  
the objectivity and utility of such  
information.

2. Much of the information CEQ  
disseminates consists of or is based on  
information submitted to CEQ by other  
Federal agencies. Prior to dissemination  
of such information, responsible CEQ  
staff will obtain a written statement  
from the agency submitting the  
information attesting that the  
information meets the agency of origin’s  
information quality guidelines.

3. In seeking to assure the  
“objectivity” and “utility” of the  
information it disseminates, CEQ will  
generally follow the basic clearance  
process established internally by the  
Chief of Staff and, where appropriate,  
the government-wide clearance process  
coordinated by OMB. Where  
appropriate, substantive input will be  
sought from within CEQ, other offices  
within the EOP, other government  
agencies, non-government  
organizations, and the public. When  
CEQ determines that the transparency of  
information is relevant for assessing the  
information’s usefulness from the  
perspective of the users of the  
information, including the public, CEQ  
shall ensure that transparency has been  
appropriately addressed and provided.  
In determining the appropriate level of  
transparency, CEQ should consider the  
types of data that can practicably be  
subjected to a reproducibility  
requirement given ethical, feasibility,  
and confidentiality constraints.

4. The CEQ staff member or official  
responsible for the dissemination of  
information should generally take the