EPA's standards and test procedures for model years 1996 through 1998.

California states in its October 16, 1996 letter, referencing both its August 21, 1995 letter and recent developments, that it has determined that its amended standards are, in the aggregate, at least as protective of the public health and welfare as the applicable federal standards. Further, California, referencing its August 21, 1995 waiver request letter, states that it continues to need separate standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions. Finally, California, referencing its August 21, 1995 letter and its Manufacturers Advisory Correspondence (MAC) ι96–05, states that its amendments are consistent with section 202(a) of the Act. Section 202(a) requires that the procedures provide sufficient lead time to permit the development and application of requisite technology, giving appropriate consideration to the cost of compliance within such period. In addition, EPA has held that section 202(a) prohibits the procedures from imposing inconsistent certification requirements such that manufacturers would be unable to demonstrate compliance with both the California and Federal requirements with the same test vehicle and using a single test sequence.

California's request will be considered according to the procedures for a waiver determination, thus an opportunity for a public hearing is being provided. Any party wishing to present testimony at the hearing and/or to submit written comments should address the following issues:

(1) Whether California's determination that its standards are at least as protective of public health and welfare as applicable Federal standards is arbitrary and capricious;

(2) Whether California needs separate standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions; and,

(3) Whether California's standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are consistent with section 202(a) of the Act.

II. Procedures for Public Participation

Any party desiring to make an oral statement on the record should submit ten (10) copies, if feasible, of its proposed testimony and other relevant material to Mr. Dickinson of EPA's Vehicles Programs and Compliance Division at the address listed above not later than March 24, 1997. In addition, the party should submit 25 copies, if feasible, of the planned statement to the presiding officer at the time of the hearing.

In recognition that a public hearing is designed to give interested parties an opportunity to participate in this proceeding, there are no adverse parties as such. Statements by participants will not be subject to cross-examination by other participants without special approval by the presiding officer. The presiding officer is authorized to strike from the record statements which he or she deems irrelevant or repetitious and to impose reasonable limits on the duration of the statement of any participant.

If a hearing is held, the Agency will make a verbatim record of the proceedings. Interested parties may arrange with the reporter at the hearing to obtain a copy of the transcript at their own expense. Regardless of whether a public hearing is held, EPA will keep the record open until April 30, 1997. Upon expiration of the comment period, the Administrator will render a decision on CARB's request based on the record of the public hearing, if any, relevant written submissions and other information which she deems pertinent.

Persons with comments containing proprietary information must distinguish such information from other comments to the greatest possible extent and label it as ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI).

If a person making comments wants EPA to base its waiver decision in part on a submission labeled as CBI, then a nonconfidential version of the document which summarizes the key data or information should be submitted for the public docket. To ensure that proprietary information is not inadvertently placed in the docket, submissions containing such information should be sent directly to the contact person listed above and not to the public docket. Information covered by a claim of confidentiality will be disclosed by EPA only to the extent allowed and by the procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. If no claim of confidentiality accompanies the submission when it is received by EPA, it may be made available to the public without further notice to the person making comments.

Dated: February 24, 1997.

Mary D. Nichols,

Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 97–5034 Filed 2–27–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[ER-FRL–5477–8]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 OR (202) 564–7153.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed February 17, 1997 Through February 21, 1997 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 970060, Final EIS, AFS, ID, Priest Lake Ranger District Noxious Weed Control Project, Implementation, Idaho Panhandle National Forest, Bonner County, ID and Pend Oreille County, WA, Due: March 31, 1997, Contact: Tim Layser (208) 443–2512.

EIS No. 970061, Draft EIS, AFS, SD, Anchor Hill Mine Expansion Project in Gilt Edge Mine, Plan-of-Operations, Black Hills National Forest, SD, Due: April 14, 1997, Contact: Don Murray (605) 578–2744.

EIS No. 970062, Draft EIS, DOI, UT, Uintah Unit Replacement Project, Implementation, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Approval of Permits, Duchesne and Uintah Counties, UT, Due: April 29, 1997, Contact: R. Terry Holzworth (801) 226–7100.

EIS No. 970063, Draft EIS, COE, CA, Upper Guadalupe River Flood Control Project, Construction, Santa Clara Valley Water District, Santa Clara County, CA, Due: April 14, 1997, Contact: Robert F. Smith (415) 977–8450.

EIS No. 970064, Final EIS, AFS, WA, Taneum/Peaches Road Access Project, Issuance of Two Temporary Permits to Plum Creek for Road Construction, Wenatchee National Forest, Cle Elum Ranger District, Kittitas County, WA, Due: March 31, 1997, Contact: Douglas Campbell (509) 674–4411.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 960576, Final EIS, AFS, WA, Huckleberry Land Exchange Consolidate Ownership and Enhance Future Conservation and Management, Federal Land and Non Federal Land, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, Skagit, Snohomish, King, Pierce, Kittitas and Lewis Counties, WA, Contact: Doug Schrenk (206) 888–1421. Review Period was erroneously extended to –21–97 in Published FR—02–07–97. Review Period Official ended on 1–21–97.

EIS No. 960586, Draft EIS, AFS, MT, Basin Creek Drainage, Salvage Timber and Watershed Rehabilitation, Kootenai National Forest, Three Rivers Ranger District, Lincoln

County, MT, Due: March 24, 1997, Contact: Jeanne Higgins (406) 295–4693. Published FR—08–23–96—Review Period Reopened.

Dated: February 25, 1997

B. Katherine Biggs,

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

[FR Doc. 97–5074 Filed 2–27–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

[ER–FRL–5477–9]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared February 10, 1997 Through February 14, 1997 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) 564–7167.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 5, 1996 (61 FR 15251).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–BLM–K67040–CA Rating EC2, Imperial Open-Pit Heap Leach Precious Metal Mine Project, Plan of Operation, Right-of-Way Approval, Conditional-Use-Permit and Reclamation Program Approval, Imperial County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns based on potential impacts to surface waters and recommendations for improved facilities design, and requested additional information regarding avoidance and mitigation of impacts to waters of the U.S., reduction of PM10 emissions, and facilities design.

ERP No. D–COE–C36074–NJ Rating EC2, Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet Feasbility Study, New Jersey Shore Protection Study, Storm Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration, with in the Communities of Avalon, Stone Harbor and North Wildwood, Cape May County, NJ.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns over the alternatives analysis, potential impacts to benthic communities and water quality from beach nourishment activities, and the potential impacts associated with this and other erosion/storm damage protection projects in New Jersey. Additional information is requested in the final EIS to address these issues.

ERP No. D–COE–G39031–LA Rating LO, Mississippi River—Gulf Outlet (MRGO) New Lock and Connecting Channels Replacement and Construction for Connection to the Mississippi River, Implementation, Orleans and St. Bernard Parishes, LA.

Summary: EPA has no objection to the selection of the Tentatively Selected Plan provided that the described mitigation measures are implemented.

ERP No. D–FHW–L40201–WA Rating EC2, US 101 Highway Aberdeen-Hoquian Corridor Project, Improvements, US Coast Guard and COE Section 404 Permit, Grays Harbor County, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns based on unavoidable impacts to wetlands and potential impacts to other waters of the US. Additional information is needed to clarify design specifications resulting from certain flood frequency data, and to ensure that proper stormwater management practices will be implemented to protect receiving-water quality appropriately.

ERP No. D–FTA–D54038–MD Rating EC2, Metrorail Extension—Addison Road Station to the Largo Town Center, Transportation Improvements, Prince George's County, MD.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns that environmental issues have not been adequately addressed. The alternatives analysis does not adequately compare alternatives. Secondary and cumulative impacts were not fully addressed as well. Information regarding environmental justices issues was not clearly documented.

ERP No. D–IBR–K29000–CA Rating EO2, Interim South Delta Program (ISDP), Construction and Operation, Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta, Implementation, COE Section 404 Permit, Alameda, Contra Costa and San Joaquin Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections and is concerned that all of the alternatives analyzed could have significant adverse impacts on fish and aquatic resources and that, generally, the proposed project does not advance that long-term objectives of ecosystem restoration as expressed through the CALFED Long-Term Bay-Delta Program. EPA asked that alternatives be redesigned and evaluated in the context of the Long-Term Program.

ERP No. D–NAS–E12005–00 Rating EC2, Engine Technology Support, Implementation, With Emphases on Liquid Oxygen and Kerosene, Advanced Space Transportation Program, Test Sites: Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC) in Huntsville, AL; Stennis Space Center (SSC) near Bay St. Louis, MS and Phillips Laboratory, Edwards Air Force Base, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding wetlands, groundwater and other unresolved issues; however, these can be addressed by the requested additional information.

ERP No. DS–FHW–K40099–HI Rating EC2, Makai Boulevard Concept/Nimitz Highway Improvements, Updated Information, Construction from Keehi Interchange to Pier 16 (AWA Street) in the Kalihi-Palama District, Funding, US Coast Guard and COE Section 404 Permits, City of Honolulu and Honolulu County, HI

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the project and asked FHA to provide more information regarding the sole source aquifer, erosion and stormwater impacts to water quality, and the alternative analysis.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–BLM–K67038–NV Ruby Hill Gold Mining Operations Project, Implementation, Battle Mountain District, Plan of Operations and COE Section 404 Permit, Eureka County, NV.

Summary: EPA's concerns regarding the project's air emissions have been addressed in the FEIS, however mitigation measures remain vague. EPA supports BLM's decision to add partial backfilling to the preferred alternative and EPA urged BLM to reduce project disturbance by 120 acres.

ERP No. F–FHW–E40757–AL Eastern Pleasure Island Hurricane Evacuation Route Construction, AL–182 in Orange Beach to CR–95 near CR–20 (on the mainland) and CR–95 near CR–20 to I–10, Funding and US Coast Guard Bridge and COE Section 404 Permits Issuance, Baldwin County, AL.

Summary: EPA's review found that impacts to wetlands were of concern and that additional wetland mitigation and agency coordination was needed.

ERP No. F–FHW–E40767–FL Tampa Interstate Project, Funding, I–275 to just north of Cypress Street and I–275 from the Howard Frankland Bridge/Kennedy Boulevard ramps north to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard and I–4 from I–275, Hillsborough County, FL.

Summary: EPA's review found that noise impacts to urban residents were of concern and that the affected communities and housing developments should be allowed to participate in noise abatement plans.

ERP No. F–FRC–L05206–WA Snoqualmie Falls Hydroelectric Project