

Hall County, NE, Wait Period Ends: 07/25/2005, Contact: Randal P. Sellers 402-221-3054.

*EIS No. 20050247, Draft EIS, SFW, AZ, Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge, Comprehensive Conservation Plan, Wilderness Stewardship Plan, Implementation, Ajo, AZ, Comment Period Ends: 08/15/2005, Contact: John Slown 505-248-7458.*

*EIS No. 20050248, Draft EIS, COE, TX, Upper Trinity River Basin Project, To Provide Flood Damage Reduction, Ecosystem Improvement, Recreation and Urban Revitalization, Trinity River, Central City, Fort Worth, Tarrant County, TX, Comment Period Ends: 08/08/2005, Contact: Dr. Rebecca Griffith 817-886-1820.*

*EIS No. 20050249, Draft EIS, BLM, ID, Cotterel Wind Power Project and Draft Resource Management Plan Amendment, To Build a 190–240 megawatt, Wind-Powered Electrical Generation Facility, Right-of-Way Application, City of Burley, Towns of Albion and Malta, Cassia County, ID, Comment Period Ends: 09/22/2005, Contact: Scott Barker 208-677-6699.*

*EIS No. 20050250, Draft EIS, AFS, OR, Ashland Forest Resiliency Project, To Recover from Large-Scale High-Severity Wild Land Fire, Upper Bear Analysis Area, Ashland Ranger District, Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest, Jackson County, OR, Comment Period Ends: 08/08/2005, Contact: Linda Duffy 541-552-2900.*

*EIS No. 20050251, Draft EIS, AFS, CA, Watdog Project, Proposes to Reduce Fire Hazards, Harvest Trees, Using Group Selection Methods, Feather River Ranger District, Plumas National Forest, Butte and Plumas Counties, CA, Comment Period Ends: 08/08/2005, Contact: Katherine Worn 530-534-6500.*

*EIS No. 20050252, Final EIS, NPS, CO, Colorado National Monument General Management Plan, Implementation, Mesa County, CO, Wait Period Ends: 07/25/2005, Contact: Bruce Noble 970-858-3617, Ext. 300.*

*EIS No. 20050253, Draft Supplement, COE, MD, Poplar Island Restoration Project (PIERP) To Evaluate the Vertical and/or Lateral Expansion, Dredging Construction and Placement of Dredged Materials, Chesapeake Bay, Talbot County, MD, Comment Period Ends: 08/08/2005, Contact: Mark Mendelsohn 410-962-9499.*

*EIS No. 20050254, Final Supplement, NOA, 00, Amendment to the Fishery Management Plans (FMPs), Amendment 2 for the Spiny Lobster Fishery; Amendment 1 for the Queen Conch Resources; Amendment 3 for the Reef Fish Fishery; Amendment 2*

Corals and Reef Associated Invertebrates, U. S. Caribbean to Address Required Provisions MSFCMA, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Island, Wait Period Ends: 07/25/2005, Contact: Dr. Roy Crabtree 727-824-5301.

*EIS No. 20050255, Final EIS, BLM, 00, Programmatic—Wind Energy Development Program, To Address Stewardship, Conservation and Resource Use on BLM-Administered Lands, Right-of-Way Grants, Western United States, Wait Period Ends: 07/25/2005, Contact: Ray Brady 202-452-7773.*

Dated: June 21, 2005.

**Robert W. Hargrove,**  
Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 05-12529 Filed 6-23-05; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[ER-FRL-6664-7]**

### Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared 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 1, 2005 (70 FR 16815).

### Draft EISs

*EIS No. 20050157, ERP No. D-AFS-J65441-MT, Middle East Fork Hazardous Fuel Reduction Project, Implementation of Three Alternatives, Bitterroot National Forest, Sula Ranger District, Ravalli County, MT.*

### Summary

EPA supports the proposed action, but expressed environmental concerns about increased sediment loads and consistency with the restoration strategy in the draft Bitterroot Headwaters TMDL. EPA recommended additional watershed restoration measures such as road decommissioning and other mitigation to reduce these impacts.

### Rating EC2

*EIS No. 20050162, ERP No. D-CGD-G03027-00, Pearl Crossing Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Deepwater Port Terminal and Pipeline Project,*

Proposes to Construct a Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Receiving, Storage, and Regasification Facility, Gulf of Mexico, Cameron and Calcasieu Parishes, LA and San Patricio County, TX.

### Summary

EPA expressed objections to the open rack re-gasification system due to adverse environmental impacts to Gulf waters and habitat. EPA believes that these impacts can be corrected by the project modifications or other feasible technology, and requested additional information to evaluate and resolve the outstanding issues.

### Rating EO2

*EIS No. 20050166, ERP No. D-AFS-K65281-CA, Brown Project, Proposal to Improve Forest Health by Reducing Overcrowded Forest Stand Conditions, Trinity River Management Unit, Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Weaverville Ranger District, Trinity County, CA.*

### Summary

EPA expressed environmental concerns about the proposed alternative and impacts to water quality, old-growth and late-successional forest, and soil erosion, and requested additional information on consultation for effects to fisheries and impacts to air quality.

### Rating EC2

*EIS No. 20050196, ERP No. D-NPS-J61106-UT, Burr Trail Modification Project, Proposed Road Modification within Capitol Reef National Park, Garfield County, UT.*

### Summary

EPA has no objections to the preferred alternative.

### Rating LO.

*EIS No. 20050179, ERP No. DS-AFS-J65419-MT, Gallatin National Forest, Updated Information, Main Boulder Fuels Reduction Project, Implementation, Gallatin National Forest, Big Timber Ranger District, Big Timber, Sweetgrass and Park Counties, MT.*

### Summary

The Supplemental DEIS has addressed impacts to the northern goshawk, the issue of fire risk, and increased public and firefighter safety. EPA continues to have environmental concerns about potential effects on water quality, fisheries and riparian functions and habitats and recommends the Final EIS include mitigation measures to address these impacts.

Rating EC2.

#### Final EISs

**EIS No. 20050145, ERP No. F-FHW-H40178-MO, I-64/US 40 Corridor, Reconstruction of the Existing 1-64/US 40 Facility with New Interchange Configurations and Roadway, Funding, City of St. Louis, St. Louis County, MO.**

#### Summary

EPA's previous issues were resolved; therefore, EPA has no objection to the proposed action.

**EIS No. 20050169, ERP No. F-BLM-J65413-MT, Dillon Resource Management Plan, Provide Direction for Managing Public Lands within the Dillon Field Office, Implementation, Beaverhead and Madison Counties, MT.**

#### Summary

The Final EIS addressed most of EPA's concerns while balancing multiple use objectives with protection, restoration, and enhancement of resources. However, we continue to recommend additional management direction to protect water quality, fisheries and riparian habitat and restore watershed functions.

**EIS No. 20050170, ERP No. F-DOE-K06007-CA, Site-wide Continued Operation of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) and Stockpile Stewardship and Management, Implementation, Alameda and San Joaquin Counties, CA.**

#### Summary

EPA previous issues have been adequately addressed; therefore, EPA has no objection to the action as proposed.

**EIS No. 20050178, ERP No. F-FHW-G40173-LA, I-49 South Lafayette Regional Airport to LA-88 Route US-90 Project, Upgrading Existing US-90 from the Lafayette Regional Airport to LA-88, Funding, Iberia, Lafayette and St. Martin Parishes, LA.**

#### Summary

No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

**EIS No. 20050218, ERP No. F-NPS-L61227-OR, Crater Lake National Park General Management Plan, Implementation, Klamath, Jackson and Douglas Counties, OR.**

#### Summary

No formal letter was sent to the preparing agency.

Dated: June 21, 2005.

**Robert W. Hargrove,**  
*Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.*

[FR Doc. 05-12555 Filed 6-23-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[FRL-7928-9]**

#### State Allotment Percentages for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Program

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The 1996 Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Amendments established a Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) program and authorized \$9.6 billion to be appropriated for the program through fiscal year 2003. Congress directed that allotments for fiscal year 1998 and subsequent years would be distributed among States based on the results of the most recent Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey and Assessment. In this notice, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is announcing revised DWSRF program State allotment percentages in accordance with the results from the most recent 2003 Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey and Assessment (Needs Assessment), which was released on June 14, 2005. The revised State allotment percentages affect DWSRF program appropriations for fiscal years 2006 through 2009. Beginning in fiscal year 1998, EPA established a formula that allocates funds to the States based directly on each State's proportional share of the total need for States, provided that each State receives a minimum share of one percent of the funds available to the States, as required by the SDWA. EPA has made the determination that it will continue to use this method for allocating DWSRF program funds. The findings from the 2003 Needs Assessment will change the percentage of the DWSRF program funding received by some States in prior years. This change reflects an increase or decrease in these States' share of the total needs for States and will allow appropriations disbursements to more accurately reflect the needs of the States to reach the public health objectives of the SDWA. The Agency believes that the 2003 Needs Survey and Assessment more accurately captures needs for necessary long-term rehabilitation and replacement of deteriorating

infrastructure that were under-reported in the earlier surveys.

**DATES:** This notice is effective June 24, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For technical inquiries, contact Jeff McPherson, Drinking Water Protection Division, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (4606M), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 564-6878; fax number: (202) 564-3757; e-mail address: [mcpherson.jeffrey@epa.gov](mailto:mcpherson.jeffrey@epa.gov). Copies of this document and information on the Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey and Assessment and the DWSRF program can be found on EPA's Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/>.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The 1996 Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Amendments established a Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) program and authorized \$9.6 billion to be appropriated for the program through fiscal year 2003. Through federal fiscal year 2005, Congress has appropriated \$7.8 billion for the DWSRF program. Congress directed that allotments for fiscal year 1998 and subsequent years be distributed among States based on the results of the most recent Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey and Assessment (SDWA section 1452(a)(1)(D)(ii)), which must be conducted every four years. The first survey, which reflected 1995 data, was released in February 1997 and the second survey, which reflected 1999 data, was released in February 2001. The 2003 Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey and Assessment, which was conducted over the last two years, was released on June 14, 2005 (EPA 816-R-05-001). The survey and assessment was completed in cooperation with the States. The States participated in both the design and development of the survey. The survey examined the needs of water systems and used these data to extrapolate needs to each State. The survey included all of the nation's 1,342 largest systems (those serving over 40,000 people) and a statistical sample of 2,553 systems serving 3,301—40,000 people. For the 1999 Needs Assessment, EPA conducted site visits to approximately 600 small community water systems and 100 not-for-profit noncommunity water systems. The EPA believes that the needs captured from the site visits in 1999 represented a fair and complete assessment of these systems' 20-year needs. Findings from 1999 were very similar to the findings in 1995,