

Dated: April 11, 2000.

Joseph C. Montgomery,
Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office
of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 00-9370 Filed 4-13-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6253-3]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared March 27, 2000 through March 31, 2000 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.

Summary of Rating Definitions Environmental Impact of the Action

LO—Lack of Objections

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC—Environmental Concerns

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EO—Environmental Objections

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU—Environmentally Unsatisfactory

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are

unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1—Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2—Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3—Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-BIA-K65223-CA Rating EC2, Cortina Integrated Solid Waste Management Project, Development and Operation, Approval of Land Lease Cortina Indian Rancheria of Wintin Indians, Colusa County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding water quality impacts and the lack of mitigation measures.

ERP No. D-BLM-L65338-OR

Rating EC2, John Day River Management Plan, Implementation, John Day River Basin, Gilliam, Grant, Wheeler, Crook, Harney, Jefferson, Morrow, Sherman, Umatilla, Union and Wasco Counties, OR.

Summary: EPA expressed concern about the degraded environmental conditions in the wild and scenic corridor and the relatively minor adjustments being proposed for land management, which may not be sufficient to protect/enhance the resource values, or comply with state water quality standards. EPA requested that the plan include both implementation and effectiveness monitoring to measure progress in meeting goals/objectives, and to enable BLM and partners to make needed adjustments.

ERP No. D-DOE-L09814-ID Rating EC2, Idaho High-Level Waste and Facilities Disposition, Construction and Operation, Bannock, Bingham, Bonneville, Butte, Clark, Jefferson and Madison Counties, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns about, and requested additional information on: (1) The effectiveness of the grout containing the low-level waste (LLW) in preventing contamination of the aquifer for 500 years, (2) the reclassification of waste stream products as LLW, (3) the existence of adequate facilities for handling LLW, (4) the feasibility of the Hanford alternative, and (5) the accuracy of the cost analysis.

No. D-SFW-L36100-WA Rating EC2, Tacoma Water Green River Water Supply Operations and Watershed Protection Habitat Conservation Plan, Implementation, Issuance of a Multiple Species Permit for Incidental Take, King County, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding flow management, fish passage, and adaptive management. Additional information was requested on gravel enrichment, water conservation, cumulative effects, and the need to integrate the terms of the HCP with the TMDL for 303(d) listed waters.

ERP No. D-SFW-L65335-WA Rating EC2, Crown Pacific Project, Issuance of a Multiple Species Permit for Incidental Take, Hamilton Tree Farm, Habitat Conservation Plan, Whatcom and Skaget County, WA.

Summary: EPA had environmental concerns regarding the issuance of the Incidental Take Permit. EPA suggested that Crown Pacific should improve the

approach to riparian management; apply the mass wasting prescriptions on a limited area/trial basis; and establish quantitative, measurable performance targets for resource management objectives. In addition, EPA recommended that adaptive management commitments be incorporated into the HCP and/or that a shorter term for the ITP, with an option to renew, be considered.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-DOE-L09812-WA Hanford Remedial Action, Revised and New Alternatives, Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Hanford Site lies in the Pasco Basin of the Columbia Plateau, WA.

Summary: No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. F-SFW-L64045-00 Grizzly Bear (*Ursus arctos horribilus*) Recovery Plan in the Bitterroot Ecosystem, Implementation, Endangered Species Act, Proposed Special Rule 10(j) Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bears in the Bitterroot Area, Rocky Mountain, Blaine, Camas, Boise, Clearwater, Custer, Elmore, Idaho, Lemhi, Shoshone.

Summary: No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

Dated: April 11, 2000.

Joseph C. Montgomery,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 00-9371 Filed 4-13-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6577-6]

Notice of Proposed Administrative Order on Consent Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), East Multnomah County Groundwater Contamination Site, Portland, OR

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; request for comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 122(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9622(i), notice is hereby given that the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), the State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality ("DEQ") and the City of Portland ("the City") have negotiated a proposed

Administrative Order on Consent ("Consent Order") pursuant to section 122(g) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622(g), as amended, and applicable Oregon state law, to be issued jointly by EPA and DEQ to the City, with respect to the East Multnomah County Groundwater Contamination Site in Oregon ("Site").

DATES: Comments must be provided on or before May 15, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Alan Goodman, Project Manager, Oregon Operations Office, Environmental Protection Agency, 811 SW Sixth Avenue, 3rd Floor, Portland, Oregon, 97204, and refer to In the Matter of East Multnomah County Groundwater Contamination Site, Proposed Administrative Order on Consent for the City of Portland.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Alan Goodman, Project Manager, Oregon Operations Office, Environmental Protection Agency, 811 SW Sixth Avenue, 3rd Floor, Portland, Oregon, 97204, (503) 326-3685.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The City's primary emergency and seasonal water supply is the Columbia South Shore Well Field in East Multnomah County. The City's well field is downgradient from known sources of hazardous substance groundwater contamination that are part of the Site. The City owns property at each of the well sites, as well as other property and easements throughout the well field area. Based on certifications and disclosures by the City, EPA and DEQ have concluded that the City has not disposed of or arranged for the disposal of hazardous substances at the Site. EPA and DEQ have also concluded that, although City pumping in 1987 may have caused the movement of contamination, the City has not contributed to a release of hazardous substances at the Site resulting in the incurrance of response costs by the government or other authorized parties. EPA and DEQ have a Memorandum of Agreement to coordinate their activities to require parties responsible for the contamination to cleanup the Site.

The major provisions of the Consent Order require a cash payment from the City to DEQ, which is the lead Agency managing cleanup of the Site, to help defray past or future response costs at or in connection with the Site, including costs incurred in connection with negotiation and entry of this Consent Order, and a grant of access by the City to DEQ and EPA to the City property for all response activities to be taken at the Site; in exchange for legal protection for the City for cleanup liability at the Site in the form of a covenant not to sue from EPA and DEQ.

Copies of the proposed Consent Order may be examined at the Oregon Operations Office, 811 SW Sixth Avenue, 3rd Floor, Portland, Oregon, 97204. A Copy of the proposed Consent Order may be obtained by mail or in person from the Oregon Operations Office.

Authority: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9622(i).

Chuck Findley,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 00-9236 Filed 4-13-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission for Extension Under Delegated Authority, Comments Requested

April 6, 2000.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before June 13, 2000. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.