minority and low-income communities with the goal of achieving environmental justice. This tentative determination to approve the Community's requests for use of an alternative landfill standard is consistent with EO 12898. By allowing the Community to use the site-specific flexibility provided by part 258, the Community is placed on a parity with those owners and operators of MSWLF units regulated by authorized state Subtitle D programs. This tentative determination fosters non-discrimination in implementing Subtitle D of RCRA.

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)

The NTTAA requires agencies to consider using suitable voluntary consensus standards to carry out policy objectives or activities. As a rule of particular applicability, this tentative determination to approve the alternative landfill requirements is not subject to the NTTAA.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This tentative decision is not an information collection request subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act

As a rule of particular applicability, this tentative determination to approve the alternative landfill requirements is not subject to the Regulatory Flexibility Act, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

This tentative determination is a rule of particular applicability and does not include a federal mandate imposing enforceable duties upon state, local, or tribal governments. On this basis, this tentative determination is not subject to the requirements of the Unfunded Mandates Act.

Authority: This notice is issued under the authority of sections 2002, 4004, 4005, and 4010 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6912, 6944, 6945, and 6949a. The Regional Administrator is making this decision in accordance with EPA Delegations Manual No. 8–47 (October 8, 1993).

Dated: April 27, 1998.

Felicia Marcus,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 98–12150 Filed 5–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

American Heritage Rivers Initiative

AGENCY: Council on Environmental Quality.

ACTION: Description of Administration policy regarding congressional opposition to designation of American Heritage Rivers.

Immediately following the 1997 State of the Union Address, President Clinton instructed the Cabinet to work with communities on the design of the American Heritage Rivers initiative to support community-led efforts that spur economic revitalization, protect natural resources and the environment, and preserve our historic and cultural heritage. In response to this initiative, communities across the country nominated 126 rivers (or stretches of rivers) for designation as an American Heritage River. An advisory committee of nonfederal experts will review all nominations and recommend rivers to the President for designation.

An interagency working group convened by the White House developed guidelines for the review of nominations. As stated in the **Federal Register** Notice of September 17, 1997 and President Clinton's Executive Order of April 7, 1998, the advisory committee will provide an assessment of the following for each nomination:

1. The scope of each nomination's application and the adequacy of its design to achieve the community's goals;

2. Whether the natural, economic (including agricultural), scenic, historic, cultural, and/or recreational resources featured in the application are distinctive or unique;

3. The extent to which the community's plan of action is clearly defined and the extent to which the plan addresses all three American Heritage Rivers objectives—natural resource and environmental protection, economic revitalization, and historic and cultural preservation—either through planned cooperative action or past accomplishments.

4. The strength and diversity of support for the nomination and plan of action as evidenced by letters from local and State governments, Indian tribes, elected officials, any and all parties who participate in the life and health of the area nominated, or who have an interest in the economic life and cultural and environmental vigor of the involved community.

The Administration believes that public input into the design of the initiative and into individual river nominations is critically important. Representatives from Federal agencies traveled around the country to meet with community organizations, local governments and industry associations to learn their views on the initiative and incorporate them into its design.

On May 19, 1997, the Administration published a notice in the **Federal Register** requesting comment about the initiative's structure, the criteria used to determine eligible rivers, the needs of communities for technical assistance and funding, and other items. The Administration incorporated many of the more than 1,700 comments received during the more than 90 days of public input into the final design of the initiative that was published on September 17, 1997 in the **Federal Register**. This notice also included how communities apply for designation, specifically asking them to demonstrate strong and diverse public support for the nomination.

Nominations closed on December 10, 1997. Members of Congress were sent copies of nominations from their districts and asked to provide comments to the Administration by January 23, 1998.

The Administration received more than 200 responses from Members of Congress, both in support and opposition, to particular nominations. Overall, Members expressed support for rivers that were nominated in their districts or State by more than a 4:1 ratio.

The views of Members of Congress on specific nominations have particular importance in evaluating applications. Elected officials such as Members of Congress represent a diversity of concerns within a community that need to be taken into account. Furthermore, the views of Members of Congress are especially relevant in this case since American Heritage Rivers is a Federal initiative on behalf of those communities. The Administration concluded accordingly that, under the conditions described in this notice, if a Member of Congress opposes the nomination of a river in his or her district, it means that a sufficient strength and diversity of support were not demonstrated for such a designation, and that the nomination did not satisfy that particular criteria.

In order to respond to the views of Members of Congress who oppose specific nominations, the Administration has agreed that the nomination of certain rivers or stretches of river would be excluded from consideration for designation under this initiative, if the Member so requested.

The way in which this exclusion works is summarized in this notice as follows.

A Member of the U.S. House of Representatives may request that a nomination as an American Heritage River not be considered for selection. If the entire nominated portion of the river flows through the district of that Member, then the nomination will not be considered by the advisory committee. If only a portion of the river flows through the Member's district, then that portion of the river would not be included in any designation by the President. The advisory committee in its consideration of that nomination would need to weigh the extent to which that exclusion affects the merit of the balance of the nomination. A Member may only make such a request for rivers, or portions of rivers, that flow through his or her district and may not exclude from consideration the nomination of a river in the district of another Member.

Likewise, the Senators from a state may request that a nomination as an American Heritage River not be considered for selection. A request made by both Senators will be dispositive of the application. If the entire nominated portion of the river flows through the state of the Senators, then the nomination will not be considered by the advisory committee. If only a portion of the river flows through the Senator's state, then that portion of the river would not be included in any designation by the President. The advisory committee in its consideration of that nomination would need to weigh the extent to which that exclusion affects the merit of the balance of the nomination. A Senator may only make such a request for rivers or portions of rivers that flow through his or her state and may not exclude from consideration the nomination of a river in another state. Of course, if a single Senator opposes a nomination, and the other Senator and the relevant House Member express no view, the nomination will not be considered by the advisory committee.

Where the view of a single Senator who opposes a nomination conflicts with the position of the other Senator from that state or a Member of Congress (for that part of a river which he or she represents) because one or the other supports the nomination, then the views of all members of the Congressional delegation will be presented to the advisory committee. In such cases, the advisory committee will evaluate the merits of the nomination and the degree to which the criteria of strength and diversity of support have been satisfied by the application. However, if any House Member opposes a nomination, then no designation of any stretch of the river will be considered in his district as previously outlined in this notice.

Nine rivers completely eliminated from consideration by Congressional opposition:

- Clearwater River, ID, MT—Representative Helen Chenoweth (ID–1), Senator Conrad Burns (MT), Senator Larry Craig (ID), Representative Rick Hill (MT–ALL), Senator Dirk Kempthorne (ID);
- Gunnison River, CO—Representative Scott McInnis (CO–3), Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell (CO);
- Osage River, MO—Representative Ike Skelton (MO–4);
- St. Mary's River, MI—Representative Bart Stupak (MI–1);
- San Joaquin River, CA—Representative George Radanovich (CA–19);
- San Juan River, NM—Representative Bill Redmond (NM–3);
- San Luis Rey River, CA—Representative Randy Cunnningham (CA–51), Representative Ron Packard (CA–48);
- Snohomish River, WA—Representative Jack Metcalf (WA–2);
- Upper Rio Grande, NM—Representative Bill Redmond (NM–3), Representative Steve Schiff (NM–1), Joe Skeen (NM–2).

Sixteen rivers affected in part by Congressional opposition:

- American River, CA—Representative John Doolittle (CA–4), Richard Pombo (CA–11);
- Arkansas River, AR, CO, OK, KS—Representative Marion Berry (AR–1), Senator Sam Brownback (KS), Representative Tom Coburn (OK–2), Representative Jay Dickey (AR–4), Representative Jerry Moran (KS–1), Representative Todd Tiahrt (KS–4), Asa Hutchinson (AR–3), Senator Tom Hutchinson (AR), Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell (CO);
- Cold Water Creek, MO—Representative James Talent (MO–2);
- Columbia River, OR—Senator Gordon H. Smith (OR);
- French Broad River, NC—Representative Charles Taylor (NC–11);
- James River, VA—Representative Thomas Bliley, Jr. (VA–7);
- Jordan River, UT—Representative Christopher Cannon (UT–3);
- Mississippi River, MO—Representative Pat Danner (MO–6), Representative James Talent (MO–2);
- Missouri River, MT, MO, NE, SD—Representative Pat Danner (MO–6), Representative Rick Hill (MT–ALL), Representative Kenny Hulshof (MO–9), Representative James Talent (MO–2), Representative Ike Skelton (MO–4), Senator Sam Brownback (KS), Senator Conrad Burns (MT), Senator Hagel (NE), Representative John Thune (SD–ALL), Representative Vincent Snowbarger (KS–3);
- Ohio River, IN—Representative John Hostettler (IN–8);
- Ouachita River, LA/AR—Representative Jay Dickey (AR–4), Representative Asa Hutchinson (AR–3), Senator Tim Hutchinson (AR);
- St. John's River, FL—Representative David Weldon (FL–15), Representative Cliff Stearns (FL–6);
- San Antonio River, TX—Representative Lamar Smith (TX–21);
- South Platte River, CO—Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell (CO);
- Santa Cruz River, AZ—Senator Jon Kyl (AZ);
- Yellowstone River, WY, MT—Representative Barbara Cubin (WY–ALL), Representative Rick Hill (MT–ALL), Senator Conrad Burns (MT), Senator Michael Enzi (WY), Senator Craig Thomas (WY);
- Williamette River, OR—Senator Gordon H. Smith (OR).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karen Hobbs, Agency Representative, Council on Environmental Quality, Old Executive Office Building, Room 360, Washington, D.C. 20501. Phone: 202–395–7417; Fax: 202–456–6546.

Dated: May 6, 1998.

Kathleen A. McGinty,

Chair, Council on Environmental Quality.

[FR Doc. 98–12432 Filed 5–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3125–01–M

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

[FEMA–1214–DR]

Alabama; Amendment No. 4 to Notice of a Major Disaster Declaration

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice amends the notice of a major disaster for the State of Alabama, (FEMA–1214–DR), dated April 9, 1998, and related determinations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 29, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Madge Dale, Response and Recovery Directorate, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–3260.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The notice of a major disaster for the State of Alabama, is hereby amended to include the following area among those areas determined to have been adversely