

of funds (RROF) and environmental certifications from State grant recipients and objections from government agencies and the public in accordance with subpart H of 24 CFR part 58. Indian tribes, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa must forward to the responsible HUD field office the environmental certification, the RROF and any objections received, and must recommend to HUD whether to approve or disapprove the certification and RROF.

Authority

1998 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act (Pub. L. 105-174, 112 Stat. 58, at 76-77, approved May 1, 1998); Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (Pub. L. 105-276, 112 Stat. 2461, section 215, approved October 21, 1998).

Dated: March 4, 1999.

Cardell Cooper,

Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development.

[FR Doc. 99-5859 Filed 3-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-29-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Restoration of a Portion of Icicle Creek Near Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, Chelan County, WA

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior. Cooperating Agency: Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: This notice advises the public that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and U.S. Forest Service intend to gather information necessary for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS will consider, analyze and disclose the potential environmental impacts of a site specific restoration project on Icicle Creek. The proposed restoration site is approximately 3 miles south of the town of Leavenworth, Washington on the grounds of the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery. The restoration objectives include: (1) Providing passage to habitat above the hatchery to native fish, and (2) restoring the historic Icicle Creek channel within the hatchery grounds. To achieve these objectives, alternative restoration strategies may

include the following actions: modification or removal of weirs in the original channel; removal of the diversion dam from Icicle Creek and restoration of streamflow in the historic channel; removal of silt that has built up in holding ponds in the historic channel; and removal of the canal and energy dispersion spillway. This notice is being furnished pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Regulations (40 CFR 1501.7 and 1508.22) to obtain suggestions and information from other agencies and the public on the scope of issues and alternatives to be considered in preparation of the EIS.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope and analysis of this proposal should be received by June 1, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments regarding the scope of the EIS should be addressed to Greg Pratschner, National Fish Hatchery Manager, 12790 Fish Hatchery Road, Leavenworth, Washington 98826. Comments should be received on or before June 1, 1999, at the above address. Written comments may also be sent by facsimile to (509) 548-6263. Comments received will be available for public inspection by appointment during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday) at the above office; please call for an appointment. All comments received will become part of the administrative record and may be released.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Corky Broadus, Public Information Officer, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, 12790 Fish Hatchery Road, Leavenworth, Washington 98826; phone (509) 548-7641.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed Icicle Creek Restoration Project was prompted by citizens interested in re-establishing fish passage to upper Icicle Creek. The original design of the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery involved diverting the majority of the flow of Icicle Creek to a canal and construction of holding dams and ponds in the original channel. These structures effectively blocked upper Icicle Creek to fish passage and reduced the effective stream channel by 1.5 miles. Since these structures are no longer necessary for hatchery operation, a fish passage and stream restoration project has been proposed. The environmental analysis will examine different ways to restore this portion of Icicle Creek as well as re-establish fish passage.

A range of alternatives for stream restoration will be considered, including: a no action alternative (maintaining the current situation), an alternative that would remove all unnecessary in-stream structures, an alternative that would remove silt which has been deposited in the historic stream channel and an alternative where diversion of the main flow of Icicle Creek would be returned to the historic channel. Other alternatives may be developed in response the comments received during public scoping.

To date the following issues have been identified: hydrologic and sedimentation concerns, potential water quality changes, tribal fishing, recreational fishing, irrigation or water rights, hatchery operations, economic concerns, heritage values, and sensitive plants, animals and fish.

The decision to be made through this analysis is where, how, and to what extent should stream restoration and fish passage projects be implemented at the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery.

The U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, has agreed to participate as a cooperating agency to evaluate potential effects to sensitive plants and animals and to recreation in upper Icicle Creek, and to provide hydrologic and planning skills. Public participation will be especially important at several points during the analysis. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is seeking information, comments and assistance from federal, state, tribal, and local agencies, as well as individuals and organizations who may be interested or be affected by the proposed actions. This information will be used in preparation of the draft EIS. The scoping process includes: (1) Identifying potential issues; (2) identifying additional alternatives; and (3) identifying potential environmental effects of the proposed alternatives. The Service invites written comments on the scope of this project. In addition, the Service gives notice of this analysis so the interested and affected people are aware of how they may participate and contribute to the final decision.

Dated: March 3, 1999.

Don Weathers,

Regional Director, Region 1, Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 99-5935 Filed 3-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P