DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

43 CFR Part 418

RIN 1006–AA37

Adjustments to 1988 Operating Criteria and Procedures (OCAP) for the Newlands Irrigation Project in Nevada

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; availability of supplementary information and extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: This document announces the availability of detailed information on the computerized modeling run of Newlands Project operations used in developing the proposed rule, and the availability of summary information on other operations modeling runs considered. Also, the comment period on the proposed rule is extended by 60 days. The proposed rule adjusting the 1988 OCAP for the Newlands Irrigation Project was published in the **Federal Register** on December 9, 1996 (61 FR 64832). Written comments were requested by February 7, 1997. Several agencies and individuals have requested additional information and asked that the comment period be extended to provide additional time for the collection and analysis of relevant information and preparation of comments. As a result of these requests, the comment period has been extended until April 8, 1997.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted to be received by April 8, 1997. All comments received on or before that date will be considered and addressed in the Final Rule. Comments received after that date will be reviewed and considered as time allows.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be to the following address: Adjusted OCAP, Truckee-Carson Coordination Office, 1000 E. William Street, Suite 100, Carson City, NV 89701–3116. Supplemental information is available at the same address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeffrey Zippin, Team Leader, Truckee-Carson Coordination Office, (702) 887–0640, or Ann Ball, Manager, Lahontan Area Office, (702) 882–3436.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Additional Information

Several individuals, organizations, and agencies have requested additional information regarding the proposed Adjustments to the 1988 OCAP. These parties want to see the data developed using the Truckee River operations model to examine in detail how the proposal may affect the Newlands Project water supply. The following information is available:

- A single page summary of modeling runs for the 1988 OCAP, the proposed Adjustments to the 1988 OCAP, and other modeling runs considered. This document is identified as ''Multiple Modeling Runs Summary''
- A 36-page summary of the ''174,000 acre-foot Storage Target Run'' for the proposed rule including 29 parameters relating to the Truckee River reservoir releases, Truckee and Carson River stream flow, Truckee Canal, Truckee Division, Lahontan Reservoir, Carson Division, Pyramid Lake, and Cui-ui. This document is identified as ''Proposed 1988 OCAP Adjustments Modeling Summary.''
- The 400-plus-page complete modeled output used to develop the proposed rule and identified as the ''174,000 acre-foot Storage Target Run.'' The data include monthly results for approximately 100 parameters over the 94-year period 1901–1994.

Questions and Answers

Two public workshops were held in Fallon and Fernley, Nevada, January 8 and 9, 1997, respectively, to describe and answer technical questions about the proposed adjustments to the 1988 OCAP. The following questions and answers taken from the public workshops and from additional questions received on the proposed rule are presented below to assist reviewers in better understanding and commenting upon the proposed rule.

1. Q. Did the computer modeling runs used in developing the proposed rule include precipitation, runoff, or snowpack forecasts?

A. Administration of the OCAP every year relies on real-time runoff forecasts. However, the computer modeling uses historical records of Truckee and Carson River hydrology, including precipitation and snowpack runoff, and an error factor to simulate forecasting errors in assessing how the proposed rule would affect Newlands Project operations and water supply over a 94-year period of record.

2. Q. The model uses a total Project diversion demand of 294,000 acre-feet. Does this demand include both Carson Division and Truckee Division demand?

A. Yes, the 294,000 acre-foot demand includes active water rights in both Divisions.

3. Q. In the computer model, the ''beginning cui-ui'' number (adult females) remains constant in the modeling runs. Why is a constant value used?

A. The beginning cui-ui number is a common starting number in the cui-ui model. It is a calculated number, approximately 50,000, from the Cui-ui Recovery Plan. Because all the modeling is essentially a hindcast, it uses historical hydrology and historical conditions in the cui-ui population as a starting point. By using a common beginning, we can evaluate the effects of different water management actions on cui-ui. This is the basis for comparison of cui-ui population response to various water regimes on the Truckee River.

4. Q. Should the computer model be changed to reflect the increased cui-ui population of today?

A. No, it is not necessary to use the latest cui-ui numbers in evaluating relative impacts of different modeling runs. It is more important to use a common beginning because we are trying to compare the effects of different modeling runs on cui-ui. In these modeling runs, the starting number represents an initial condition. Just as in a bank account, you start with an initial deposit and then adjust the balance over time for deposits, withdrawals, interest, and fees. You don't go back and adjust the initial deposit just because you have more money in the bank today.

5. Q. Does the 294,000 acre-foot demand include water rights acquired to restore Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge and Carson Lake and Pasture wetlands?

A. Yes, it includes wetland water rights acquired to date which are approximately 5,200 acres of Carson Division agricultural water rights.

6. (a) Q. Does the model assume wetland water rights are used at 2.99 acre-feet per acre?

A. Yes, the modeling assumes a use rate of 2.99 acre-feet per acre.

(b) Q. What happens to the additional 0.51 or 1.51 acre-feet per acre?

A. The additional 0.51 or 1.51 acre-feet per acre stays in Lahontan Reservoir where it does two things. It increases the Carson Division water supply to all water users in shortage years; in full water years it remains in Lahontan Reservoir and reduces Truckee River diversions to the Reservoir in subsequent years.

7. Q. Are wetland water rights assumed to come out of the Truckee River diversions to the Project, increasing shortages to the Carson Division of the Project?

A. No, wetland water rights are acquired, active, agricultural water rights from within the Carson Division or from sources on the Carson River above Lahontan Reservoir. Water rights

acquired within the Carson Division share the same amount of Truckee River water, if any, in a given year as the rest of the Carson Division.

8. Q. Do the new conveyance efficiency targets include the delivery to Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge and Carson Lake and Pasture?

A. Yes, the conveyance efficiency targets apply to all water users, including the wetlands.

9. Q. If Project facilities are altered or new facilities constructed to aid water deliveries to the wetlands, will conveyance efficiency requirements be adjusted to account for such changes?

A. Carson Division conveyance efficiency measures the amount of water delivered to headgates as a percentage of the Lahontan Reservoir water released to serve those water rights. Changes in conveyance efficiency requirements could be considered in the future. It is premature to consider how changes to the wetlands water delivery system might affect conveyance efficiencies until such time as we know how much water delivery is affected, the stage of the water acquisition program, the geographic distribution of acquisitions, the degree to which entire canal/lateral systems are retired because appurtenant water rights have been acquired, conversion of Project irrigated lands and water use to development or municipal and industrial (M&I) use, and conveyance efficiency improvements made. At this time, it is impossible to know whether conveyance efficiencies would improve or decline from changes in the water delivery system.

10. Q. How was the proposed 65.7 percent conveyance efficiency requirement determined.

A. The 65.7 percent conveyance efficiency is an example based on 1995 Project data. The Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) constructed a linear extrapolation comparing the conveyance efficiency required in the 1988 OCAP for 64,850 water-righted acres with what would be required for 59,075 water-righted acres.

11. Q. Does the proposed conveyance efficiency requirement assume that the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District (TCID) will line canals?

A. No specific assumptions are made on the methods by which TCID will improve Project conveyance efficiency. Canal lining would be one way to improve conveyance efficiencies, as would better water measurement. Additional information on conveyance efficiency has been provided to TCID and other interested parties in the BOR's 1994 efficiency study for the Newlands Project. That document is available at the address above.

12. Q. Is the proposed Lahontan Reservoir storage target of 174,000 acre-feet a limit on how much water can be stored in the Reservoir at any time?

A. No, the proposed end-of-June storage target of 174,000 acre-feet would be used to determine if water would be needed from the Truckee River as a supplemental supply to Carson River inflow to the Reservoir. That target does not limit how much water can be stored in Lahontan Reservoir. Above the target, Carson River water may fill the Reservoir to its capacity.

13. Q. Since the adjustment to the Lahontan Reservoir storage targets is based in part on the reduced Project demand when compared to the 1988 OCAP, what will happen if the water transfer litigation results in greater acreage and more water demand?

A. This is something that bears watching and could be considered for changes in the future. The outcome of the water transfer litigation is unknown and may not be resolved for several years. Other changes within the Project may affect water demand, including but not limited to continued development of agricultural lands, changes in demand as the FWS acquires water (see number 4.b above), and water dedications to future M&I use. At this time, it is not possible to say whether future demand will increase or decrease, or know the magnitude of the change.

14. Q. Modeling for the 1988 OCAP indicated four shortage years for the Project. Why do the proposed Adjustments to the 1988 OCAP show nine shortage years?

A. The 1988 OCAP modeling used the hydrology for the 80-year period, 1901–1980, which included shortages in drought years 1931, 1934, 1961, and 1977. The proposed Adjustments to the 1988 OCAP are modeled using the hydrology from the 94-year period 1901–1994. The 14-year period 1981–1994 included five additional drought years (1988, 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1994) which adds five more shortage years. When the 1988 OCAP is examined using the 94-year hydrology, there are also nine shortage years.

15. Q. Why was the end of June storage target in Lahontan Reservoir reduced by 19 percent (174,000 acre-feet versus 215,000 acre-feet) when the project acreage is only 9 percent less than anticipated in the 1988 OCAP (59,075 acres versus 64,850 acres)?

A. The proposed storage target adjustments attempt to (among other things) more closely balance the water supply to the demand in the Carson Division. The demand is based on water-righted, irrigated acres to be served. The supply is composed of inflow to Lahontan Reservoir from the Carson River and water from the Truckee River as a supplementary supply. In the proposed rule, the Lahontan storage targets, which govern Truckee River diversions, are adjusted so that the decrease in average water supply is commensurate with the current demand. Just a percentage comparison of storage targets and acreage does not tell the whole story. The proposed 19 percent change in the storage target for regulating the supplemental supply is not comparable to the change in demand based on water-righted, irrigated acres. For example, even if demand were reduced 100 percent based on zero irrigated acres, there would still be enough water supply from the Carson River inflow alone to serve tens of thousands of acres. In developing the proposed rule, percentage reductions in storage targets were considered but those targets did not adjust the supply to match the current demand. Based on modeled averages, Carson Division water supply in the proposed Adjustments to the 1988 OCAP compared to under the 1988 OCAP assumptions indicates a decrease of 7 percent (264,120 acre-feet versus 284,180 acre-feet). As noted in the question, the acreage difference is 9 percent less.

16. Q. Why does modeling show a difference in the proposal between the water shortages in the Carson Division between the Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe and the rest of the water users?

A. The difference in shortage between the Fallon Tribe and the rest of the Carson Division results from the cap on their water use. During shortages, Project water deliveries have been based on total water-righted acres. The Fallon Tribe total water right is 19,041 acre-feet, but use is capped at 10,587.5 acre-feet. [Public Law 101–618, section 103(c)] The Tribe's supply of water in a water short year is based on its water right, thus in any shortage year down to a 56 percent year, the Tribe would receive all of its water permitted by the use cap.

Extension of the Comment Period

The comment period on the proposed Adjustments to the 1988 OCAP rulemaking is extended to allow parties to consider the supplemental material being made available through this notice, and because of flooding in western Nevada. The Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers in Nevada began flooding on January 1, 1997, and continued under flood watches and warnings in some river segments for several weeks. Some parties interested in or affected by the proposed

rulemaking have been directly affected by the flooding. Many more parties, including the public, and local, State, and Federal agencies wish to make comments on the proposed rule but have been preoccupied in flood water management operations and/or flood recovery activities. The Truckee-Carson Coordination Office has received many written requests for extension, all citing the floods as affecting the time they have available to review the proposed rule and provide comments. An additional 60 days would allow all interested parties to review the proposed rule and supplemental information, and prepare and submit comments.

John Garamendi,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–3946 Filed 2–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–RK–M

Bureau of Land Management

43 CFR Parts 6300 and 8560

[WO–420–1060–00 24 1A]

RIN 1004–AB69

Wilderness Management

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Extension of comment period for proposed rule.

SUMMARY: On December 19, 1996, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) published a document in the **Federal Register** announcing a proposed rule to revise and update existing regulations for management of designated wilderness areas (61 FR 66968). The 60-day comment period for the proposed rule expires on February 18, 1997. BLM has received several requests from the public for additional time to comment and is extending the comment period for an additional 60 days.

DATES: Submit comments by April 21, 1997.

ADDRESSES:

If you wish to comment, you may:

(a) Hand-deliver comments to the Bureau of Land Management, Administrative Record, Room 401, 1620 L St., NW., Washington, DC.;

(b) Mail comments to the Bureau of Land Management, Administrative Record, Room 401LS, 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240; or

(c) Send comments through the internet to WOComment@wo.blm.gov. Please include ''attn: AB69'', and your name and return address in your Internet message. If you do not receive a confirmation from the system that we have received your internet message, please contact us directly at (202) 452–5030.

You will be able to review comments at BLM's Regulatory Affairs Group office, Room 401, 1620 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, during regular business hours (7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m.) Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rob Hellie, Cultural Heritage, Wilderness, Special Areas & Paleontology Group, at (202) 452–7703.

Dated: February 11, 1997.

Frank Bruno,

Acting Manager, Regulatory Affairs Group.

[FR Doc. 97–3823 Filed 2–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–84–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 73 and 76

[MM Docket Nos. 94–150, 92–51, 87–154, 91–221, 87–8, 96–222 & 96–197; DA 97–210]

Broadcast Services; TV Ownership; Newspaper/Radio Cross Ownership

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of reply comment deadline.

SUMMARY: The Commission granted a two-week extension of the deadline to file reply comments in the above-cited dockets in response to a request filed by the Media Access Project (MAP) on behalf of a number of other organizations. The deadline to file reply comments in these proceedings is now March 21, 1997. The Commission determined that a brief extension of the reply comment deadline was warranted to facilitate the development of a full record, but declined to grant a longer extension of the reply comment deadline or to extend the deadline for filing initial comments as requested by MAP. The intended effect of this action is to allow the parties additional time to review the initial comments filed in these proceedings and to prepare reply comments responding to the issues raised in the initial comments.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Reply comments are now due by March 21, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 2000 M Street, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kim Matthews, Mania Baghdadi, Paul Gordon, Roger Holberg or Charles Logan (202) 418–2130, Mass Media Bureau.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the *Order* granting an extension of time for filing reply comments in MM Docket Nos. 94–150, 92–51, 87–154, 91–221, 87–8, 96–222 and 96–197; DA 97–210, adopted January 30, 1997, and released January 30, 1997. The complete text of this *Order* is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and also may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, (202) 857–3800, 2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037.

Synopsis of Order Extending Time for Filing Reply Comments

1. On November 5, 1996, the Commission adopted three related rulemaking items regarding national and local ownership of television stations and attribution of broadcast and cable/MDS ownership interests. *Notice of Proposed Rule Making,* 61 FR 66987 (December 19, 1996) in MM Docket Nos. 96–222, 91–221, and 87–8, FCC 96–437 (released November 7, 1996) (national ownership proceeding); *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making,* 61 FR 66978 (December 19, 1996) in MM Docket Nos. 91–221 and 87–8, FCC 96–438 (released November 7, 1996) (local ownership proceeding); *Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making,* 61 FR 67275 (December 20, 1996) in MM Docket Nos. 94–150, 92–51, and 87–154, FCC 96–436 (released November 7, 1996) (attribution proceeding). Comments in all three of these proceedings are currently due by February 7, 1997, and reply comments are currently due by March 7, 1997. In addition, on September 17, 1996, the Commission adopted a *Notice of* Inquiry, 61 FR 53694 (October 15, 1996) regarding its policy for waiving its newspaper/radio cross ownership restriction. *Notice of Inquiry* in MM Docket 96–197, 11 FCC Rcd 13003 (1996). Comments in that proceeding were initially due to be filed by December 9, 1996, and reply comments by January 8, 1997. By Order released December 5, 1996, the Commission extended the comment and reply comment deadlines in that proceeding to coincide with the comment and reply comment deadlines in the national ownership, local ownership, and attribution proceedings. In so doing, the Commission reasoned that the issues raised in the newspaper/radio cross ownership proceeding were similar to those raised in the other three rulemaking proceedings, and that it was appropriate that the four proceedings share the same comment and reply