1997, Contact: Renee Sigel (410) 962–4440. Published FR 06–13–97—Review Period extended.

Dated: June 10, 1997.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 97–15621 Filed 6–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5481–5]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared May 26, 1997 Through May 30, 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 04, 1997 (62 FR 16154).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–DOA–K36119–HI Rating EC2, Waimea-Paauilo Watershed Project, To Alleviate the Agricultural Water Shortage, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention, COE Section 404 Permit. Hawaii County, HI.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concern regarding the lack of an adequate discussion of purpose and need. EPA requested that the final document fully describe the purpose and need and evaluate an additional alternative which includes the Kauahi reservoir and irrigation distribution system, but omits the stockwater distribution system.

ERP No. D–DOE–L36109–00 Rating LO, Watershed Management Program Standards and Guidelines, Implementation, ID, NV, MT, OR, WA and WY.

Summary: Our abbreviated review has revealed no EPA concerns on this project.

ERP No. D–DOI–J28019–UT Rating EO2, Upalco Unit/Uinta Basin Replacement Project, Water Supply Management, Approvals and Permits Issuance, Duchesne and Uintah Counties, UT.

SUMMARY: EPA expressed environmental objection over the lack of an effective portrayal of the cumulative impacts to the aquatic resources, especially in light of past significant impacts to the aquatic systems of the project. EPA recommended that the Final EIS more clearly acknowledge the impacts of additional depletions on water quality. EPA also expressed environmental concern with the lack of detail concerning impact documentation and mitigation for the proposed wetland impacts and recommended that the Final EIS better document how and where the mitigation will occur.

ERP No. D–DOI–J39026–UT Rating EO2, Uintah Unit Replacement Project, Implementation, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Approval of Several Permits, Duchesne and Uintah Counties, UT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objection over the lack of an effective portrayal of the cumulative impacts to the aquatic resources, especially in light of past significant impacts to the aquatic systems of the project. EPA recommended that the Final EIS more clearly acknowledge the impacts of additional depletions on water quality. EPA also expressed environmental concern with the lack of detail concerning impact documentation and mitigation for the proposed wetland impacts and recommended that the Final EIS better document how and where the mitigation will occur.

ERP No. D–UAF–K11080–CA Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—McClellan Air Force Base (AFB) Disposal and Reuse Including Rezoning of the Main Base, Implementation, Federal Permits, Licenses or Entitlements, Sacramento County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the project description and water and biological resources. In particular groundwater overdraft.

ERP No. D–USN–C11013–NY Rating EC2, Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant Calverton Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Towns of Riverhead and Brookhaven on Long Island, Suffolk County, NY.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns related to wetlands, ground water, site contamination and remediation, endangered and threatened species, cultural resources and environmental justice.

ERP No. DS–NAS–A12040–00 Rating EC2, Cassini Spacecraft Exploration Mission to Explore the Planet Saturn and its Moons, Implementation.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns that the radiological does estimates were presented in the document without sufficient information regarding key underlying assumptions used to make those estimates.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–COE–C35011–00 Newark Bay Confined Disposal Facility (NBCDF), Construction, Dredged Material Disposal Site, NY and NJ.

Summary: Although the Final EIS addressed many of the concerns expressed by EPA during the review of the Draft EIS, EPA remains concerned that the preferred alternative may not represent the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative. In addition, EPA expressed concern over the proposed cap monitoring program and requested that formal coordination with applicable federal and state agencies occur prior to issuance of a permit to address those concerns.

ERP No. F–FTA–G40143–TX North Central Corridor Light Rail Transit (LRT) Extension, Transportation Improvements, Funding, NPDES Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, Dallas and Collin Counties, TX.

Summary: Review of the Final EIS has been completed and the project found to be satisfactory. No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. F–NOA–C90016–NJ Mullica River–Great Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve Establishment, Site Designation and Plan Implemention, Ocean, Atlantic and Burlington Counties, NJ.

Summary: EPA had no objections to the implementation of the proposed project. Based upon our review of the FEIS, our concerns have been adequately addressed.

ERP No. F–SCS–K36115–HI Upcountry Maui Watershed, Implementation, To Address Agricultural Water Shortage, COE Section 404 Permit, Makawao District, Island of Maui, Maui County, HI.

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

Dated: June 10, 1997.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 97–15622 Filed 6–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P