

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE****Department of the Army****Notice of Availability of the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Mission and Master Plan, Fort Bliss, Texas and New Mexico**

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DoD.  
**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

**SUMMARY:** This announces the availability of the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS). The DPEIS assesses the potential environmental impacts of the approval of revisions to components of the Fort Bliss Real Property Master Plan and adoption of the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, and the Training Area Development Concept, as well as modifies the general land use plan to increase the availability of controlled access field training sites in the Fort Bliss Training Complex.

**DATES:** The public comment period for the DPEIS will end 45 days after publication of the Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register** by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

**ADDRESSES:** To obtain a copy of the DPEIS, contact Vicki Hamilton, U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss, Directorate of the Environment, ATTN: AZC-DOE-C (PEIS), Building 624 North, Pleasanton Road, Fort Bliss, TX 79916-6812.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Vicki Hamilton at (915) 568-2774, or e-mail PEIS@emh10.bliss.army.mil.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The alternatives to no action (continuation of current mission, land use and management) considered in this DPEIS are:

a. *Alternative 1:* Incorporates the current missions assigned to Fort Bliss as described in the no action alternative. Alternative 1 is to adopt recent updates to components of the Fort Bliss Real Property Master Plan (the Long-range Component, Short-range Component, and informal modifications to the Mobilization Component). In addition, the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, the Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plan and the supplement to the Long-range component with a definitive land use plan for the Fort Bliss Training Complex presented in Chapter 3.0 (Current Conditions) of the Training Area Development Concept would be adopted. Adoption of these plans would authorize the steps leading to program

and appropriate project implementation as described in the DPEIS.

b. *Alternative 2:* Adopts the general land use plan for increasing the availability of controlled access field training sites on the Fort Bliss Training Complex in addition to actions in Alternative 1. If adopted programatically, evaluation of proposed specific sites will be accomplished in a separate National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document(s) that may be tiered off of the Final PEIS that follows this DPEIS.

c. *Alternative 3:* Adopts the general land use plan for conceptual uses of the Fort Bliss Training Complex presented in Chapter 4.0 (Future Development Concept) of the Training Area Development Concept in addition to actions in Alternatives 1 and 2. If approved programatically, evaluation of specific projects proposed in the future will be accomplished under the NEPA. The document includes analyses of the environmental consequences each alternative may have on land use, infrastructure, airspace, earth resources, air quality, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, safety, hazardous materials and items of special concern, socioeconomic, and environmental justice. The findings indicate that potential environmental impacts from each alternative may include changes to land use, increased soil erosion, slight impacts to biological and cultural resources, and cumulative impacts to water resources. Improved management practices are anticipated under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3. The level of land use may increase under Alternatives 2 and 3.

A public meeting for the purpose of receiving comments on this DPEIS will be in El Paso, Texas; and Las Cruces and Alamogordo, New Mexico. Additional detail will follow in the media, or contact the Fort Bliss Public Affairs Office at (915) 568-4505. Public comments received on the DPEIS will be addressed in the Final PEIS and considered by the Army in its Record of Decision.

The revised Long-range Component of the Fort Bliss Real Property master Plan, the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, the Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plan, and the Training Area Development Concept are available for review in the following libraries: (1) El Paso Public Library main Library, 501 North Oregon Street, El Paso, TX 79901, (2) Irving Schwartz Branch, El Paso Public Library, 1865 Dean Martin Drive, El Paso, TX 79936; (3) Westside Branch, El Paso Public Library, 125 Belvidere Street, El Paso, TX 79912; (4) Library,

Dell City, TX 79837; (5) University of Texas at El Paso, Library, 500 West University Avenue, El Paso, TX 79968; (6) Branigan Memorial Library, 200 E Picacho Avenue, Las Cruces, NM 88001; (7) Library, 920 Oregon, Alamogordo, NM 88310; (8) New Mexico State University Branson Library, Frenger at Williams, Las Cruces, NM 88003; (9) New Mexico State University, Roswell, Library, 52 University Boulevard, Roswell, NM 88202-6000; (10) Library, 20 Curlew Place, Cloudcroft, NM 88317-9998.

Dated: August 12, 1998.

**Raymond J. Fatz,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health), OASA (I,L&E).*

[FR Doc. 98-22107 Filed 8-17-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE****Department of the Army****Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Changes to Utilization of Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona**

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DoD.  
**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

**SUMMARY:** This notice of availability announces the public release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The Draft EIS is programmatic in nature and discloses impacts associated with direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the proposed action under a range of alternatives. New missions and programs require land use changes and construction of new facilities and military ranges. Examples of changes to YPG's mission that may result in this action include: combat systems testing, troop training, and private sector use of facilities. Activities to support this action include modernization of outdated facilities, improvements to infrastructure, installation of utilities, and land use changes. An environmental assessment prepared to evaluate the effect of the Installation Master Plan determined that significant effects were likely to result from these changes.

**DATES:** Written public comments received within 45 days of the date of publication of the Environmental Protection Agency's Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** To receive a copy of this Draft EIS, or to submit comments, contact: Directorate of Environmental Sciences, STEYP-ES-C (ATTN: Mr.

Junior D. Kerns), Yuma Proving Ground, AZ 85365.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Junior D. Kerns at (520) 328-2148.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Resources discussed in the draft are climate, air, water, geology and soils, biology, cultural resources, socioeconomics, land use, noise, hazardous materials/waste management, radiation, health and safety, aesthetic values, utilities, and transportation. Situated in southwestern Arizona, the installation is a desert evaluation and test center with premier facilities for testing military materiel.

The proposed action is the conversion of YPG from a traditional Army test installation to a diversified, multipurpose test range. The multipurpose test installation will integrate training, privatization, and other mission-compatible uses with research, development, test, and evaluation activities indicated in the Installation Master Plan and other applicable planning documents. This proposed action supports the defense mission of the United States to maintain a prepared and technologically advanced military.

Five alternatives are considered: (1) Maintain baseline activity levels (no action), (2) decreased military mission, (3) increased military mission, (4) modified nonmilitary mission, and (5) diversified mission. Impacts of each alternative are disclosed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act. The Army will develop a preferred alternative after consideration of impacts described in the Draft EIS and public comment.

Comments may also be submitted via phone at (800) 330-1348.

Dated: August 13, 1998.

**Raymond J. Fatz,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army  
(Environment, Safety and Occupational  
Health) OASA(I,L&E).*

[FR Doc. 98-22187 Filed 8-17-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98-712-000]

#### Florida Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

August 12, 1998.

Take notice that on August 6, 1998, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT), 1400 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP98-

712-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 157.205, 157.212) under the Natural Gas Act (NGA) for authorization to modify an existing gas measurement station for use as a delivery point in Jefferson County, Texas, under FTG's blanket certification issued in Docket No. CP82-553-000, pursuant to Section 7 of the NGA, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

FGT states that the measurement station was authorized by the Commission under budget-type certification authorization in Docket No. CP79-302 and placed in service as a receipt point in 1981. FGT now proposes to modify the facilities so that they can be used for deliveries to Midcon Texas Pipeline Operator, Inc. (Midcon). FGT asserts that no customers are presently receiving gas at this measurement station and FGT does not anticipate any future use of the facilities to receive gas into its system.

It is stated that the facilities will be used to deliver up to 100,000 MMBtu equivalent of natural gas on a peak day and 36,500,000 MMBtu equivalent on an annual basis to Midcon. It is explained that the end-use of the gas would be commercial, industrial and residential. It is stated that FGT's FERC Gas Tariff does not prohibit additional delivery points. It is explained that the volume of gas delivered to Midcon will be within existing authorized levels of service and that the proposal will not have any adverse impact on FGT's peak day and annual deliveries. It is asserted that FGT has sufficient capacity to continue all services without detriment or disadvantage to FGT's other customers.

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. 98-22114 Filed 8-17-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP98-374-000]

#### Koch Gateway Pipeline Company; Notice of Proposed Changes to FERC Gas Tariff

August 12, 1998.

Take notice that on August 7, 1998, Koch Gateway Pipeline Company (Koch) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheets, to become effective September 7, 1998.

#### Fifth Revised Volume No. 1

Thirteenth Revised Sheet No. 29  
Fifth Revised Sheet No. 1908  
Second Revised Sheet No. 102  
Second Revised Sheet No. 2001  
First Revised Sheet No. 201  
First Revised Sheet No. 2005  
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 202  
Second Revised Sheet No. 2801  
Second Revised Sheet No. 300  
Third Revised Sheet No. 3602  
Second Revised Sheet No. 302  
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 3610  
First Revised Sheet No. 303  
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 4100  
Third Revised Sheet No. 304  
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 4101  
First Revised Sheet No. 718  
Fifth Revised Sheet No. 4200  
Fifth Revised Sheet No. 802  
Fifth Revised Sheet No. 4201  
Sixth Revised Sheet No. 805  
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 4300  
Sixth Revised Sheet No. 806  
Second Revised Sheet No. 4301  
Seventh Revised Sheet No. 807  
Third Revised Sheet No. 4401  
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 1408  
Third Revised Sheet No. 4501  
Sixth Revised Sheet No. 1409  
Third Revised Sheet No. 4700  
Tenth Revised Sheet No. 1412  
Second Revised Sheet No. 4701  
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 1500  
First Revised Sheet No. 4760  
Sixth Revised Sheet No. 1501  
First Revised Sheet No. 4761  
Third Revised Sheet No. 1806  
Second Revised Sheet No. 4805  
Third Revised Sheet No. 1901  
Third Revised Sheet No. 4901  
Second Revised Sheet No. 4902

The above referenced sheets are being filed to reflect minor clerical corrections to Koch's Gas Tariff.

In accordance with Section 154.209 of the Commission's Regulations, copies of