Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate and/or permission and approval for the proposed abandonment are required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

G. Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-20487 Filed 8-17-95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Docket No. CP95-676-000]

Richfield Gas Storage System; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

August 14, 1995.

Take notice that on August 8, 1995, Richfield Gas Storage System (Richfield), 2 Warren Place, 6120 S. Yale, Suite 1200, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74136, filed in Docket No. CP95–676–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, and 157.212) for approval to operate an existing tap and side valve as a new delivery point located in Stevens County, Kansas for delivery of natural gas to Associated Gas Services, Inc.

(AGS) ¹ to interconnect to facilities to be constructed by Utilicorp United (Utilicorp), a local distribution company, for ultimate consumption by Utilicorp's end-user customers, under the blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP93–679–000, pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Richfield indicates that the quantity of natural gas it will deliver through the proposed delivery point is 1,000 Mcf on a peak day, and 150,000 Mcf annually, respectively. Richfield further indicates that the new delivery point will also serve as an interconnect between the Richfield system and a lateral, no greater than four inches, to be constructed by Utilicorp, through which AGS will delivery gas to Utilicorp for ultimate consumption by Utilicorp's end-user customers. Richfield states that it is not proposing to construct any facilities.

Richfield states that its tariff does not prohibit the addition of new delivery points. It is indicated that Richfield will provide service to AGS pursuant to the terms and conditions of its FERC Gas Tariff, Rate Schedule FSS–1 and Rate Schedule ISS–1. Richfield further states that the operation of the subject delivery point will not result in an increase in the total daily or annual quantities Richfield is presently authorized to store for AGS. Richfield indicates that it has capacity to operate the proposed delivery point without adversely impacting its other storage customers.

Any person or the Commission's Staff may, within 45 days of the issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214), a motion to intervene and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205), a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, the proposed activities shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–20488 Filed 8–17–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-4725-8]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared July 03, 1995 Through July 07, 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.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 14, 1995 (60 FR 19047).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-AFS-J65236-MT Rating EC2, North Fork Decision Area Fire Recovery Project, Timber Salvage, Implementation, Kootenai National Forest, Rexford Ranger District, Lincoln County, MT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the potential impacts of the proposed action on the watershed of the North Fork of Big Creek where the majority of activities are proposed. Peak stream flow thresholds are already being exceeded here and EPA suggested additional information be supplied to fully assess and mitigate all potential environmental impacts.

ERP No. D-AFS-K65170-AZ Rating EO2, Pocket/Baker Ecosystem and Land Management Plan, Implementation, Mogollen Rim, Coconino National Forest, Coconino County, AZ.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections to the components of the preferred alternative which exceed management activity thresholds in the draft Mexican Spotted Owl (MOS) Recovery Plan and dispersal habitat guidelines. The draft EIS does not adequately evaluate potential impacts to water quality and air quality.

ÉRP No. D-AFS-L65244-ID Rating EC2, Fall Creek Post-Fire Project, Harvesting Fire-Killed and Damage Trees, Implementation, McCall Ranger District, Payette National Forest, Valley County, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns based on potential effects on water quality from timber salvage and road construction. Additional information is needed on watershed effects, water supply, water quality/fish habitat effectiveness

 $^{^{\}rm 1}\text{AGS}$ is the successor-in-interest to Grant Valley Gas Company.

monitoring and documentation for environmental effect predictions.

ERP No. D-GSA-K80036-CA Rating EC2, Fresno—United States Courthouse, Site Selection and Construction, City of Fresno, Fresno County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding potential Clean Air Act conformity issues, hazardous waste issues and energy efficiency/water conservation issues. EPA recommended that these issues be clarified in the final document.

ERP No. D-IBR-K34010-AZ Rating EO2, Tucson Aqueduct System Reliability Investigation (TASRI), Central Arizona Project, Surface Storage Reservoir Construction, COE Section 404 Permit, Gila River, City of Tucson, Pima County, AZ.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections over potential impact to the proposed action in light of recent Tucson reevaluation of use of CAP water. EPA also requested additional information concerning the habitat for the Pima pineapple cactus and would incur other biological and water quality impacts.

ERP No. D-NPS-K61137-AZ Rating EO2, Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument General Management Plan and Development Concept Plan Implementation, Portion of the Sonoran Desert, Pima County, AZ.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections based on the lack of an analysis of a full range of alternatives and that there is inadequate discussion of impacts to the resources and respective mitigation measures.

ERP No. D-NPS-L61201-WA Rating EC2, Mountain Goat Management Within Olympic National Park, Implementation, Clallan, Grays Harbor, Jefferson and Mason Counties, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the lack of coordination of goat management efforts in and outside the park. The final EIS should define overall ecosystem management objections including minimizing impacts associated with control programs, further addressing mitigation of impacts from helicopter overflights and alternatives to using helicopters, and better defining the evaluation criteria.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-AFS-K65168-CA, Falls Road Realignment and Reconstruction, Permit Approval, San Bernardino National Forest, San Bernardino County, CA.

Summary: Review of the final EIS was not deemed necessary. No formal

comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. F-FHW-L40189-WA, WA-525/Paine Field Boulevard Project, Improvements, between WA-99 to WA-526, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, City of Mukitteo, Snohomish County, WA.

Summary: EPA had no objection to the project as proposed.

ERP No. F-HUD-J81007-UT, Guadalupe Neighborhood Project, Demolition, Rehabilitation, Construction and Development, Funding, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake City County, UT.

Summary: EPA had no objection to the action as proposed.

ERP No. FŚ-FHW-K40105-CA, Devil's Slide Bypass Improvements, CA-1 To Half Moon Bay Airport to Linda Mar Boulevard, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, Pacifica and San Mateo Counties, CA.

Summary: Review of the final EIS was not deemed necessary. No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

Regulations

ERP No. R–BIA–A99203–00, Notice of Proposed Revised Procedures Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Summary: EPA commented that BIA should seek the cooperation of the EPA in NEPA review of commercial waste disposal facilities on Indian lands, and recommended that BIA should define its categorical exclusions more narrowly.

Dated: August 15, 1995.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.
[FR Doc. 95–20572 Filed 8–17–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

[ER-FRL-4725-7]

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 August 07, 1995 Through August 19, 1995 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS NO. 950361, Final, NCS, MO, IA, East Fork of the Grand River Watershed Plan, Implementation, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention, Funding, Ringgold and Union Counties, IA and Harrison and Worth Counties, MO, Due: September 18, 1995, Contact: Russell C. Mills (314) 876–0901. EIS No. 950362, Final EIS, NPS, OR, Fort Clatsop National Memorial General Management and Development Concept Plans, Implementation, Astroia, Clatsop County, OR, Due: September 18, 1995, Contact: Cynithia Orlando (503) 861– 2471.

EIS No. 950363, Draft EIS, AFS, AK, Northwest Baranof Timber Sale (s), Implementation, NPDES, Coast Guard Bridge, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Tongass National Forest, Sitka Ranger District, Baranof Island, AK, Due: October 02, 1995, Contact: James M. Thomas (907) 747–6671.

EIS No. 950364, Draft EIS, BLM, AZ, Cyprus Bagdad Copper Mine, Mill Tailings and Waste Rock Storage Expansion, Plan of Operation, NPDES and COE Section 404 Permits, Yavapai County, AZ, Due: October 17, 1995, Contact: Mary Johnson (602) 780–8090.

EIS No. 950365, Final EIS, DOE, ME, Bangor Hydro-Electric Second 345-kV Transmission Tie Line Interconnection to New Brunswick, Construction and Operation, Presidential Permit, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, ME, Due: September 18, 1995, Contact: Anthony Como (202) 586–5935.

EIS No. 950366, Draft EIS, BLM, MT, Zortman and Landusky Mines Reclamation Plan Modifications and Mine Life Extensions, Approval of Mine Operation, Mine Reclamation and COE Section 404 Permits, Little Rocky Mountains, Phillip County, MT, Due: October 17, 1995, Contact: David L. Mari (406) 538–7461.

EIS No. 950367, Draft EIS, AFS, NV, Dash Open Pit and Underground Mining Project, Implementation, Expanding existing Gold Mining Operations at the Jerritt Canyon Project, Plan of Operation Approval and COE Section 404 Permit, Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest, Independence Mountain Range, Elko County, NV, Due: October 02, 1995, Contact: Mary Beth Marks (702) 738–5171.

EIS No. 950368, Draft EIS, UAF, CA, March Air Force Base, Disposal of Portions, NPDES and COE Section 404 Permits, Riverside County, CA, Due: November 02, 1995, Contact: Jonathan D. Farthing (210) 536–3668.

EIS No. 950369, Final Supplement, UAF, NH, ME, Pease Air Force Base (AFB) Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Portsmouth, Newington, Greenland, Rye, Dover, Durham, Madburg, Rochester, NH and Kittery, Eliot and Berwicks, ME, Due: September 18, 1995, Contact: Jonathan D. Farthing (210) 536–3787.