

Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Transcontinental Route connecting Hiawatha Light Rail Transit Line at a Multi-Modal Station, Minneapolis/St Paul International Airport and Mall of America, Bloomington, MN, Wait Period Ends: May 06, 2002, Contact: Joel Ettinger (312) 353-2865. Revision of FR Notice Published on 04/19/2002: Correction to Title.

EIS No. 020129, DRAFT EIS, BLM, OR, Kelsey Whisky Landscape Management Planning Area, Implementation, Associated Medford District Resource Management Plan Amendments, Josephine and Jackson Counties, OR, Comment Period Ends: July 12, 2002, Contact: Sherwood Tubman (541) 618-2399. Revision of FR notice published on 04/19/2002: Correction to County Joseph to Josephine County.

Dated: April 23, 2002.

B. Katherine Biggs,

Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 02-10343 Filed 4-25-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6628-4]

Notice of Intent: To Prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) on a Request To Modify a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) Between EPA and Jefferson Parish (Parish), Louisiana Prohibiting the Parish From Providing Service From the Lafitte-Marrero Waterline to a Designated Area

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 6.

PURPOSE: To comply with the National Environmental Policy Act and evaluate the potential impacts of modifying the MOA. In addition, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) may choose to rely on the SEIS in determining whether to modify a 1979 permit it issued to the Parish authorizing discharges of dredged and fill material incidental to construction of the Lafitte-Marrero Waterline.

SUMMARY: In settlement of a potential Council on Environmental Quality referral under Section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act, EPA Region 6 and Jefferson Parish entered into an MOA in 1979. In that MOA, the Parish agreed not to provide water service from the Lafitte-Marrero Waterline to a "prohibited service area" containing sensitive wetlands. The COE

incorporated the MOA as a condition of a permit it issued to the Parish for construction of the waterline pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and violation of the MOA would thus violate that permit. In 1985, EPA Region 6 prohibited future discharges of dredged or fill material to wetlands in a designated portion of the restricted service area (the Bayou Aux Carpes Swamp) pursuant to Section 404(c) of the CWA. The Parish has requested EPA to modify the 1979 MOA to allow it to provide water service to an existing swamp tour facility and a proposed "Jellystone Park" campground in the prohibited service area. As proposed, these developments are or will be located in uplands within the area subject to the 404(c) designation. Before making a decision on the Parish's request, EPA will prepare a site specific "second tier" SEIS to evaluate potential environmental effects associated with the requested modification.

Alternatives: EPA may approve or deny the request to provide service to the Peach Orchard Jellystone Park campground, as proposed, or with modifications to mitigate or reduce adverse impacts to acceptable levels. Other reasonable alternatives, including those outside EPA's authority, may also be evaluated in the SEIS.

Scoping: EPA solicits written comments from interested parties regarding environmental issues to be addressed in the Draft SEIS. Interested parties are encouraged to submit their comments within fifteen (15) days of this notice. EPA will prepare a responsiveness summary of those issues determined to be within (and not within) the scope of the SEIS.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, OR TO BE PLACED ON EPA'S SEIS MAILING LIST: Write or call Mr. Robert D. Lawrence, Chief of the Office of Planning and Coordination, EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Ave., Dallas, TX 75202; tel: (214) 665-8150.

Estimated Date of the Draft SEIS Release: Summer 2002.

Responsible Official: Gregg A. Cooke, Regional Administrator.

Dated: April 23, 2002.

Anne Norton Miller,

Director, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 02-10345 Filed 4-25-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6628-5]

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Federal Funding, Construction, Operation and Monitoring of a Coastal Wetlands Restoration Project, Mississippi River Water Reintroduction Into the Maurepas Swamp

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6 (EPA), is developing the restoration project as the designated Federal member of the Task Force created by the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act, Public Law 101-646 (CWPPRA).

PURPOSE: EPA has determined that the proposed wetlands restoration effort is a Major Federal Action significantly impacting the human environment. The purpose of the EIS is to ensure that decisions are made in accordance with the policies and purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act. The EIS will be considered by the CWPPRA Task Force in its decisions on funding and on alternative features and activities associated with carrying out the project.

SUMMARY: The proposed action provides for the reintroduction of Mississippi River water into the swamp south of Lake Maurepas in Louisiana for the purpose of restoring the ecological health and productivity of the swamp. Over time, hydrologic modifications to the riverine system have eliminated the natural inputs of fresh Mississippi River water, with its associated nutrients and sediments, that historically built and maintained the project area swamp. The swamp is now stressed and dying due to saltwater intrusion and excessive flooding due to subsidence and insufficient accumulation of sediment. The project will reintroduce approximately 1,500 cubic feet per second of Mississippi River water through a box-culvert structure constructed through the flood protection levee of the Mississippi River, then through an outflow channel for a distance of approximately five miles, and into the swamp south of Lake Maurepas. The outflow channel would be constructed near Garyville, Louisiana, and would connect to the existing Hope Canal north of U.S. Highway 61. As part of this alternative, the Hope Canal is proposed to be enlarged in order to accommodate the estimated project flow. The project is estimated to benefit more than 36,000 acres of cypress-tupelo swamp by increasing input of freshwater, sediments, and nutrients. The EIS will

consider impacts of this project with existing and/or proposed flood control measures of the foreseeable future. Efforts will be made to ensure that local drainage problems are not increased as a result of this project. Information will be provided in the EIS from reconnaissance level studies performed for preliminary project evaluation. These studies included site reviews; hydrologic modeling of existing conditions and basic reintroduction scenarios; baseline ecological field studies; and surveys of elevations and cross-sections.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS: The CWPPRA Task Force may determine to fund and construct the restoration project; the CWPPRA Task Force may deny funding and construction of the restoration project; or, the Task Force may determine to take no final action until additional funds and/or information are available. The EIS will be utilized in other actions such as the Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit which (1) may be issued as requested, (2) may be issued with conditions, or (3) may be denied.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING: The EPA will hold a public meeting to receive public input on the scope of issues to be addressed in the Draft EIS and to identify any significant issues of the proposed project. Interested individuals, groups, agencies and public officials will be encouraged to participate. The exact date and location will be provided by mailing list notice and will be published in major, local and periodic newspapers thirty days in advance.

TO SUBMIT SCOPING COMMENTS, TO REQUEST ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, OR TO BE PLACED ON THE EIS MAILING LIST, CONTACT: Mr. David McQuiddy, CWPPRA Coordinator, Marine and Wetlands Section, Water Quality Protection Division, U.S. EPA (6WQ-EM), 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, TX 75202-2733; telephone (214) 665-6722, e-mail mcquiddy.david@epa.gov, or Ms. Jeanene Peckham, U.S. EPA, Water Quality Protection Field Office, 707 Florida Blvd, Suite B-21, Baton Rouge, LA, 70801; telephone (225) 389-0736, e-mail peckham.jeanene@epa.gov.

Estimated Date for Release of Draft EIS: Winter 2003.

Responsible Official: Gregg A. Cooke, Regional Administrator.

Dated: April 23, 2002.

Anne Norton Miller,

Director, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 02-10344 Filed 4-25-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7202-5]

EPA Science Advisory Board; Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meetings: Affordability Criterion for Drinking Water Treatment Technologies for Small Systems

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Environmental Economics Advisory Committee (EEAC) of the EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) to review the Agency's affordability criterion for small systems under the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996. The SAB was established to provide independent scientific and technical advice to the EPA Administrator on Agency positions; in this case the methodology for developing and applying the affordability criterion. The EEAC is a standing committee of the SAB and is responsible for reviewing economic guidance and analyses that are used by EPA in carrying out its mission.

The review meeting will be held on June 13, 2002 at the Holiday Inn Hotel and Suites, 625 First Street, Alexandria, VA 22314, telephone (703) 548-6300. The meeting will start at 9 a.m. and conclude by 3 p.m. on that date. All times noted are Eastern Time. All meetings are open to the public, however, seating is limited and available on a first-come basis. *Important Notice:* Documents that are the subject of SAB reviews are normally available from the originating EPA office and are not available from the SAB Office—information concerning availability of documents from the relevant Program Office is included below.

The review will be conducted by the SAB's Environmental Economics Advisory Committee. Collectively, the appointed members of the EEAC have broad expertise in environmental economics and their expertise is appropriate to address EPA's charge which asks the SAB to address the economic aspects associated with development and application of the affordability criterion. The SAB will make use of Invited Experts to provide technical information and insights to inform the deliberations of the EEAC; however, these experts will not serve as members of this SAB Committee nor will they be signatories to the EEAC's report.

Background

The 1996 Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) amendments include a number

of provisions intended to help minimize the financial impact that new regulations will have on small drinking water systems. Several important provisions of SDWA (e.g., compliance technologies, variance technologies, and variances) hinge on the concept of "affordability" as it applies to smaller communities across the country. The Agency currently assesses the affordability of new regulations on the basis of (a) an estimated affordability threshold (the upper limit for the costs of water bills, including the costs of treatment, distribution, and operation), which the Agency puts at a level of 2.5% of the median household income (MHI) and (b) baseline expenditures (derived from current annual water bills and MHI). Detailed information on the Agency's approach to affordability can be found in the *Report to Congress: Small System Arsenic Implementation Issues*, dated March 2002 (see the report on the EPA Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/arsenic.html>).

The Charge

The Agency is asking the SAB for advice on economic issues associated with its national-level affordability criterion, as well as the methodology used to establish the criterion. EPA asks that while taking into consideration the structure of the Safe Drinking Water Act and the limitations of readily available data and information sources, what is the Committee's opinion of the Agency's national level affordability criterion, methodology for deriving the criterion, and approach to applying those criteria to national primary drinking water regulations (NPDWRs)? Specifically, EPA is seeking the SAB's responses to the following questions:

1. What is the SAB's view of the Agency's basic approach of comparing average compliance costs for an NPDWR with an expenditure margin, which is derived as the difference between an affordability threshold and an expenditure baseline?

2. If the basic approach is retained, should a measure other than median income that captures the impact on more disadvantaged households be used as the basis for the affordability threshold? If so, what alternative measures (e.g., 10th or 25th income percentile, poverty level income) should the Agency consider and why? What would be the likely effect of such alternatives on existing and future national level affordable technology determinations?

3. What alternatives should the Agency consider to 2.5% as the income percentage for the national level affordability threshold, and what would