

(UTU-77114), Application for Learning, Manti-La Sal National Forest, Ferron-Price Ranges District, Sanpete and Emery Counties, UT, Comment Period Ends: July 02, 2001, Contact: Stan Perks (801) 539-4038. The US Department of Agriculture Forest Service and US Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management are Joint Lead Agencies for this project.

*EIS No. 010166, Draft EIS, NPS, VA*, Green Spring Colonial National Historical Park Management Plan, Implementation, James City County, VA, Comment Period Ends: July 11, 2001, Contact: Alec Gould (757) 898-3400.

*EIS No. 010167, Draft EIS, AFS, UT*, Wasatch-Cache National Forest Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Implementation, several counties, UT and Uinta County, WY, Comment Period Ends: September 04, 2001, Contact: Jack Blackwell (801) 524-3908.

*EIS No. 010168, Final EIS, AFS, MT*, Knox-Brooks Timber Sales and Road Rehabilitation, Implementation, Lola National Forest, Super Ranger District, Mineral County, MT, Wait Period Ends: June 18, 2001, Contact: Bruce Erickson (406) 822-3957.

*EIS No. 010169, Draft EIS, FTA, NC*, Phase I Regional Rail System Improvements, Durham to Raleigh to North Raleigh, Implementation, Durham and Wake Counties, NC, Comment Period Ends: July 20, 2001, Contact: Alex McNeil (404) 562-3511.

*EIS No. 010170, Final EIS, FHW, CA*, San Francisco—Oakland Bay Bridge, East Span Seismic Safety Project, Connection between I-80 Yerba Buena Island and Oakland, US Coast Guard Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, San Francisco and Alameda Counties, CA, Wait Period Ends: June 18, 2001, Contact: C. Glenn Clinton (916) 498-5020.

*EIS No. 010171, Draft EIS, FTA, CA*, San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor Project, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on former Burbank/ Chandler Southern Pacific Rail Right-of-Way, Development and Implementation, Los Angeles County, CA, Comment Period Ends: July 03, 2001, Contact: Ervin Poka (213) 202-3950.

*EIS No. 010172, Draft EIS, FHW, MD*, MD-210 (Indian Head Highway) Multi-Modal Study, MD-210 Improvements between I-95/I-495 (Capitol Beltway) and MD-228 Funding and US COE Section 404 Permit Issuance, Prince George's County, MD, Comment Period Ends: September 23, 2001, Contact: Nelson Castellanos (410) 962-4342.

*EIS No. 010173, Draft EIS, USN, CA*, Point Molate Property Naval Fuel Depot (NFD) for the Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, City of Richmond, Contra Costa County, CA, Comment Period Ends: July 02, 2001, Contact: Roberta Montana (619) 532-0942.

#### Amended Notices

*EIS No. 010088, Draft EIS, FHW, NB*, Lincoln South and East Beltways Project, To Complete a Circumferential Transportation System linking I-80 on the north and U.S.77 on the west, Funding, COE 404 Permit, Lancaster County, NB, Comment Period Ends: June 15, 2001, Contact: Edward Kosola (402) 437-5973. Revision of FR Notice Published on 03/23/2001: CEQ Review Period Ending 05/07/2001 has been Extended to 06/15/2001.

*EIS No. 010159, Draft Supplement, DOE, NV*, Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste, Construction, Operation, Monitoring and Eventually Closing a Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Updated and Additional Information, Nye County, NV, Comment Period Ends: June 25, 2001, Contact: Jane R. Summerson (702) 794-1493. Revision of FR notice published on 05/11/2001: Correction to Title.

Dated: May 15, 2001.

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

[FR Doc. 01-12570 Filed 5-17-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6618-2]

### 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.

### 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-BLM-J65331-00 Rating E02, Williams, Questar, Kern River Pipeline Project, To Approve a Petroleum Products Pipeline, and one or two Natural Gas Pipelines and to Amend Forest Plan, UT, NM and CO.*

*Summary:* EPA expressed environmental objections with the narrow range of alternatives, new construction activity in the Uinta NF roadless area, potential air impacts to Arches National Park and the lack of information disclosed on potentially connected actions. EPA supports efforts to reduce environmental impacts by locating pipelines in existing ROW corridors, avoid landslide areas and headwaters for sources of drinking water, slightly modify the ROW to project roadless areas and use directional drilling methods which may reduce impacts to wetlands and aquatic life.

*ERP No. D-FAA-E51049-KY Rating EC2, Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport, Construction and Operation of a New 8,000-foot Runway 17/35 (Future 18R/36L); 2,000-foot Extension of Runway 9/27, Funding and Airport Layout Plan, (ALP) Boone County, KY.*

*Summary:* EPA expressed concern about proposed noise mitigation, air quality analysis, and wetland/stream mitigation. Use of adaptive management regarding the monitoring of noise contours is recommended to ensure

accurate footprints once prospective operations are initiated and when substantive changes affecting airport noise occur.

*ERP No. D-USA-D11031-MD Rating EC2, Fort George G. Meade Future Development and Operations of a New Administrative and Support Buildings, Anne Arundel and Howard Counties, MD.*

*Summary:* EPA expressed concern regarding potential impacts due to increased base traffic. EPA encouraged Fort Meade to make a committed effort to institute traffic mitigation alternatives such as flextime, flexiplace and car pooling programs.

*ERP No. DS-FAA-J51009-UT Rating EC2, Cal Black Memorial Airport Project, New and Updated Information for the Replacing of Halls Crossing Airport, within the boundary of Glen Canyon National Recreation, Halls Crossing, San Juan Counties, UT.*

*Summary:* EPA has environmental concerns with the ongoing noise impacts especially when combined with enroute jet aircraft noise, and that additional information is needed in the final Supplemental EIS that establishes a threshold of significance for these cumulative noise impacts. In addition, EPA suggests that the connected action of the proposed BLM land transfer be analyzed in a revised supplemental EIS to provide analysis of BLM's proposed action for this same airport.

#### Final EISs

*ERP No. F-AFS-J65321-MT Mill-Key-Wey Project, Proposed Timber Harvesting, Ecosystem Burning, Road Construction and Reconstruction, Implementation, Lolo National Forest, Superior Ranger District, Mineral County, MT.*

*Summary:* While the FEIS was largely responsive to EPA's comments on the DEIS, EPA continues to express concerns about timber harvests on erosive soils, wetland impacts, use of weed control chemicals, and the level of monitoring proposed to identify actual project impacts.

*ERP No. F-NOA-A91066-00 Tilefish Fishery Management Plan (FMP), (Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps), To Prevent Overfishing and to Rebuild the Resource of Tilefish, Located along the Atlantic Ocean.*

*Summary:* EPA had environmental concerns about the proposed regulations and the sufficiency of the information in the document. EPA's concern included the adequacy of the mitigation measures

and the impacts of trawling on Tilefish EFH.

*ERP No. FS-AFS-L60104-WA Huckleberry Land Exchange Consolidate Ownership and Enhance Future Conservation and Management, Updated Information, Proposal to Exchange Land and Mineral Estates, Federal Land and Non-Federal Land, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, Skagit, Snohomish, King, Pierce, Kittitas, and Lewis Counties, WA.*

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

Dated: May 15, 2001.

**Joseph C. Montgomery,**

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

[FR Doc. 01-12569 Filed 5-17-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-M**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6978-7]

### Allocation of Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Monies

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**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 be distributed among States based on the results of the most recent Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey.

In this notice, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is releasing a revised allocation for DWSRF monies among States in accordance with the results from the most recent Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey (i.e., the 1999 Drinking Water Infrastructure Survey) which was released on February 28, 2001. This revised allocation affects DWSRF program appropriations for fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

Beginning in fiscal year 1998, EPA established a formula which allocates funds to the States based directly on each State's proportional share of the total State need, 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 funds. The findings from the 1999 Needs Survey will change