Dated: March 8, 1999.

Richard T. Westlund,

Acting Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 99–6179 Filed 3–11–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6240-7]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared February 15, 1999 Through February 19, 1999 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 10, 1998 (63 FR 17856).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-BOP-D81030-WV Rating EC1, Ohio and Tyler Counties Federal Correctional Facility, Construction and Operation, ThreePossible Sites: Wheeling-Ohio County Airport Industrial Park, Fort Henry and Iver Flats, Ohio and Tyler Counties, WV.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concern regarding wetland impacts and requested that mitigation measures will be required for wetland impacts that cannot be avoided.

ERP No. D–DOE–K08021–CA Rating EO2, Sutter Power Plant Project, Operation and Maintains of a High-Voltage Electric Transmission, 500 megawatt (MW) Gas Fueled, Sutter County, Ca.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections to the proposed project based on the potential for significant environmental degradation that could be corrected by project modification or other feasible alternatives. EPA also questioned whether the proposed project would be consistent with the requirements of the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act. EPA requested additional information and clarification on alternatives analysis, construction related air impacts, potential impacts to wetlands and flood plains, cumulative impacts and various other requirements of NEPA.

ERP No. D-DOE-K08022-AZ Rating EO2, Griffith Energy Project, Construction and Operation, 520-

Megawatt (MW) Natural Gas-Fired and Combined Cycle Power Plant, Right-of-Way Grant, Operating Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, Kingman, AZ.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections to the proposed project based on the potential for significant environmental degradation that could be corrected by project modification or other feasible alternatives. EPA asked for additional information and clarification on the purpose and need statement and alternatives analysis, permitting, waterrelated impacts, and cumulative impacts. EPA also noted that proceeding with the proposed action, as described and analyzed in the EIS, could set a precedent for future actions that collectively could result in significant environmental impacts.

ERP No. DR-USN-K11083-CA Rating EO2, Hunters Point (Former) Naval Shipyard Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Revised Information, City of San Francisco, San Francisco County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections due to increased environmental impacts of the revised project. Additional information on the proposed alternatives and their air, traffic, and hazardous materials impacts is required for EPA to assess potential significant environmental impacts.

ÉRP No. DS-TVA-E07013-TN Rating EC2, Kingston Fossil Plant Alternative Coal Receiving Systems, New Rail Spur Construction near the Cities of Kingston and Harriman, Roane County, TN.

Summary: EPA raised concerns over traffic delays and noise impacts associated with coal rail delivery and increased plant air emissions for important air parameters, such as, CO and VOC's.

Final EISs

ERP No. FS-JUS-K80035-CA Service Processing Center (SPC) for Detainees, Construction and Operation, Possible Sites, Stockton and Tracy Sites, San Joaquin Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA believes additional detail should have been provided under architectural and spacial design, however we have no objection to the project as proposed.

Other

ERP No. LD-UAF-K11095-AZ Rating EO2, Barry M. Goldwater Ranger (BMGR), Renewal of the Military Land Withdrawal, Yuma, Pima and Maricopa Counties, AZ.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections with the proposed action because an indefinite

land withdrawal, for purpose such as those described, without rigorous and periodic environmental reviews could result in significant environmental degradation. EPA stressed the need for regularly reoccurring public involvement in the environmental management of military range lands and recommended that a shorter-term withdrawal period be fully evaluated and considered.

ERP No. LD-USA-G11037-NM Rating EC2, McGregor Range Military Land Withdrawal Renewal, Fort Bliss, Otera County, NM and TX.

Summary: EPA has requested an alternative for renewal for a shorter time period.

Dated: March 9, 1999.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, Office of Federal Activities. [FR Doc. 99–6185 Filed 3–11–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6240-6]

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 March 1, 1999 Through March 5, 1999

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9

EIS No. 990065, Draft EIS, COE, FL, Programmatic EIS—Rock Mining— Freshwater Lakebelt Plan, Limestone Mining Permit, Section 404 Permit, Implementation, Miami-Dade County, FL, Due: April 30, 1999, Contact: Mr. William Porter (904) 232–2259.

EIS No. 990066, Final EIS, COE, CA, Hamilton Wetland Restoration Project, Tidal Salt Marsh Habitat, Alameda County, CA, Due: April 12, 1999, Contact: Eric F. Jottiffe (415) 977–8543.

EIS No. 990067, Final EIS, FHW, IA, I—235 Study Corridor, Improvements access to the Des Moines Central Business District (CBD) and Westown Parkway Area, Funding, Des Moines, Polk County, IA, Due: April 13, 1999, Contact: Bobby W. Blackmon (515) 233–7300.

EIS No. 990068, Final EIS, DOE, TX, ID, NV, SC, TN, New Tritium Production Reactor Capacity Facilities, Siting, Construction and Operation, Implementation, Hanford Site near Richland, WA; Idaho National Engineering Laboratory near Idaho