

Sandy Farmer, USEPA ICR #0794.07,
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency, Information Policy Branch
(2316), 401 M Street SW.,
Washington, DC 20460

and

Timothy Hunt, OMB #2070-0046, Office
of Management and Budget, Office of
Information and Regulatory Affairs,
725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC
20503.

Dated: April 7, 1995.

Richard Westlund,

*Acting Director, Regulatory Information
Division.*

[FR Doc. 95-9249 Filed 4-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[ER-FRL-4722-2]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared March 13, 1995 through March 17, 1995 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) 260-5076.

Summary of Rating Definitions

Environmental Impact of the Action

LO—Lack of Objections

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC—Environmental Concerns

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EO—Environmental Objections

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the

environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU—Environmentally Unsatisfactory

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1—Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2—Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3—Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised

draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-FHW-D40275-PA Rating EC2, Kittanning By-Pass/PA-6028, Section 015 Extension of the Allegheny Valley Expressway, existing Allegheny Valley Expressway to the Traffic Route 28/66 and Traffic Route 85 Intersection, Funding and COE Section 404 and EPA NPDES Permits Issuance, Armstrong County, PA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns for potential impacts to wetlands, terrestrial habitat, and residences. EPA found alternative C Prime to be the environmentally preferable alternative because of its minimization of impacts to wetland resources.

ERP No. D-FRC-D29000-VA Rating EC2, Gaston and Roanoke Rapids Project (FERC-No. 2009-003), Nonpoint Use of Project Lands and Water for the City of Virginia Beach Water Supply Project, License Issuance, Brunswick County, VA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the water demand, as well as potential supply alternatives and requested additional information. EPA also requested water quality modeling of the lower Roanoke River prior to issuance of the final EIS, and FERC convene a session of key parties to develop an appropriate 6-10 year interim withdrawal allocation.

ERP No. D-FRC-K02008-CA Rating EC2, Mojave Natural Gas Pipeline Northward Expansion Project, Construction and Operation, Approvals and Permits Issuance, San Joaquin Valley, San Francisco Bay Area and Sacramento, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns over potential impacts to wetlands, as well as potential significant emissions during construction that may not meet Clean Air Act conformity provisions.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-IBR-J31023-UT Narrows Multi-Purpose Water Development Project, Construction and Operation, Funding, Gooseberry Creek, Manti-La Sal National Forest, Sanpete County, UT.

Summary: EPA continued to have environmental concerns about wetlands impacts, endangered species and the limited alternatives analyzed in the EIS.

ERP No. FS-COE-E30032-FL Palm Beach County Beach Erosion Project, Updated Information, Shore Protection Project, Jupiter/Carlin Segment from

Martin Co., Line to Lake Worth Inlet and from South Lake Worth Inlet to Broward, General Design Plan, Implementation, Martin and Broward Counties, FL.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the long-term consequences of how this action meshes with other, similar beach nourishment projects planned for the county's shoreline. EPA was particularly concerned over impacts to nearshore hardbottom habitat.

Dated: April 11, 1995.

B. Katherine Biggs,

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

[FR Doc. 95-9289 Filed 4-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

[ER-FRL-4722-1]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 260-5076 OR (202) 260-5075.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed April 03, 1995 Through April 07, 1995 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 950123, FINAL EIS, AFS, AK, Helicopter Glacier Landing Tours, Implementation, Issuance of Special-Use-Permits, Tongass National Forest, Chatham Area, Juneau Ranger District, Alaska, Due: May 15, 1995, Contact: John H. Favro (907) 586-8800.

EIS No. 950124, FINAL EIS, FHW, MT, US 2 Reconstruction, Columbia Heights to Hungry Horse, Funding, Land Transfer and COE Section 404 Permit, Flathead County, MT, Due: June 01, 1995, Contact: Dale Paulson (406) 449-5310.

EIS No. 950125, DRAFT EIS, AFS, NV, CA, Heavenly Ski Resort Master Plan, Improvement, Expansion and Management, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Special-Use-Permit, Douglas County, NV and El Dorado and Alpine Counties, CA, Due: May 29, 1995, Contact: Virgil Anderson (916) 573-2600.

EIS No. 950126, DRAFT EIS, FHW, AZ, Pima Freeway—Loop 101, Construction, I-17 and Scottsdale Road, Funding, NPDES and COE Section 404 Permits, Maricopa County, AZ, Due: May 30, 1995, Contact: Ken Davis (602) 379-3646.

EIS No. 950127, DRAFT EIS, FHW, IA, I-235 Study Corridor, Improvements access to the Des Moines Central Business District (CBD) and Westown Parkway Area, Funding, Des Moines,

Polk County, IA, Due: June 06, 1995, Contact: H.A. Willard (515) 233-7300.

EIS No. 950128, DRAFT EIS, USN, HI, Bellows Air Force Station Land Use and Development Plan, Implementation, Waimanalo, HI, Due: May 29, 1995, Contact: Gary Kasaoke (808) 471-9338.

EIS No. 950129, DRAFT EIS, AFS, ID, Secesh River Subdivision Access Roads, Implementation, Special-Use-Permit, Idaho County, ID, Due: May 30, 1995, Contact: Linda Fitch (208) 634-0408.

EIS No. 950130, FINAL EIS, FHW, WI, MN, Stillwater-Houlton Transportation System, MN-Trunk Highway-36 and WI-Trunk-Highway-64 Improvements, MN-Trunk-Highway-36 and Washington County-State-Aid-Highway-15 to WI-Trunk Highway-64 near the Croix River Bridge, Funding, US Coast Guard Bridge Permit, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, St. Croix, WI and Washington County, MN, Due: May 15, 1995, Contact: Cheryl Martin (612) 290-3240.

EIS No. 950131, FINAL EIS, FAA, TX, Adoption—Chase Field Naval Air Station Disposal and Reuse Implementation, as a Civilian Airport Facility, City of Beeville, Bee County, TX, Contact: Tami Buch (817) 222-5681. The US Department of Transportation's Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has adopted the Department of Defense's, US Navy final EIS filed 3-19-93. FAA was a cooperating Agency for the above final EIS. Recirculation of the document is not necessary Under Section 1506.3(c) of the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations.

EIS No. 950132, DRAFT SUPPLEMENT, COE, MS, Mississippi River and Tributaries Flood Control Plan, Big Sunflower River Maintenance Project, Yazoo Basin, Sunflower, Washington, Humphreys, Sharkey and Yazoo Counties, MS, Due: May 29, 1995, Contact: Marvin Cannon (601) 631-5437.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 940512, DRAFT EIS, FHW, PA, US 220 Transportation Improvements Project, Bald Eagle Village to Interstate 80 (I-80), Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, Blair and Centre Counties, PA, Due: May 22, 1995, Contact: Manual A. Mark (717) 782-3461. Published FR-12-23-94—Review Period Reopened.

Dated: April 11, 1995.

B. Katherine Biggs,

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

[FR Doc. 95-9290 Filed 4-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

[FRL-5191-9]

Science Advisory Board; Clean Air Act Scientific Advisory Committee; Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meeting(s); Open Meeting

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given that the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on May 4-5, 1995 at the Courtyard Marriott, 2700 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22314; telephone (703) 329-2323. The meeting will begin at 9 a.m. and end no later than 5 p.m. on both days. This meeting is open to the public. Due to limited space, seating will be on a first-come basis. For further information, please contact the individuals listed below. Documents that are the subject of SAB reviews are normally available from the originating EPA office and are not available from the SAB Office.

This meeting of the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC) will focus on reviewing the scientific and technical adequacy of the agency's "Health Assessment Document for Diesel Emissions" (a document from the Office of Research and Development, Office of Health and Environmental Assessment (OHEA), Environmental Criteria and Assessment Office in Research, Triangle Park, NC—ECAO). The specific issues to be addressed during the CASAC review are as follows:

1. Does the document accurately represent the key literature on diesel emissions?
2. Are the cancer and noncancer hazard identification and dose-response assessments scientifically appropriate? In particular:
 - (a) Is the application of dosimetry modeling scientifically sound?
 - (b) Are the modes of action appropriately identified and applied to the health assessment?
 - (c) Are the qualitative and quantitative cancer risk estimates scientifically appropriate?
 - (d) Is the diesel inhalation reference concentration (RfC) scientifically appropriate?