

Board members are covered by provisions of Section 302 of Public Law 99-662. The substance of those provisions is as follows:

a. Selection

Members are to be selected from the spectrum of commercial carriers and shippers using the inland and intracoastal waterways, to represent geographical regions, and to be representative of waterborne commerce as determined by commodity ton-miles statistics.

b. Service

The Board is required to meet at least semi-annually to develop and make recommendations to the Secretary of the Army on waterways construction and rehabilitation priorities and spending levels for commercial navigation improvements, and report its recommendations annually to the Secretary and Congress.

c. Appointment

The operation of the Board and appointment of its members are subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (PL 92-463, as amended) and departmental implementing regulations. Members serve without compensation but their expenses due to Board activities are reimbursable. The considerations specified in section 302 for the selection of the Board members, and certain terms used therein, have been interpreted, supplemented, or otherwise clarified as follows:

(1) Carriers and Shippers

The law uses the terms "primary users and shippers." Primary users has been interpreted to mean the providers of transportation services on inland waterways such as barge or towboat operators. Shippers have been interpreted to mean the purchasers of such services for the movement of commodities they own or control. Individuals are appointed to the Board, but they must be either a carrier or shipper, or represent a firm that is a carrier or shipper. For that purpose a trade or regional association is neither a shipper or primary user.

(2) Geographical Representation

The law specifies "various" regions. For the purpose of selecting Board members, the waterways subjected to fuel taxes and described in PL 95-502, as amended, have been aggregated into six regions. They are (1) the Upper Mississippi River and its tributaries above the mouth of the Ohio; (2) the Lower Mississippi River and its tributaries below the mouth of the Ohio

and above Baton Rouge; (3) the Ohio River and its tributaries; (4) the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in Louisiana and Texas; (5) the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway east of New Orleans and associated fuel-taxed waterways including the Tennessee-Tombigbee, plus the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway below Norfolk; and (6) the Columbia-Snake Rivers System and Upper Willamette. The intent is that each region shall be presented by at least one Board member, with that representation determined by the regional concentration of the individual's traffic on the waterways.

(3) Commodity Representation

Waterway commerce has been aggregated into six commodity categories based on "inland" ton-miles shown in Waterborne Commerce of the United States. In rank order they are (1) Farm and Food Products; (2) Coal and Coke; (3) Petroleum, Crude and Products; (4) Minerals, Ores, and Primary Metals and Mineral Products; (5) Chemicals and Allied Products; and (6) All other. A consideration in the selection of Board members will be that the commodities carried or shipped by those individuals or their firms will be reasonably representative of the above commodity categories.

d. Nomination

Reflecting preceding selection criteria, the current representation by the five (5) Board members whose terms expire December 31, 1997, is as follows: one member representing the Upper Mississippi River (Region 1), two members representing the Lower Mississippi River (Region 2), one member representing the Ohio River (Region 3), and one member representing the GIWW-East of New Orleans, Tenn-Tombigbee, and AIWW below Norfolk (Region 5). Also, these Board members represent two shippers and three carriers.

Three (3) of the five members whose terms expire December 31, 1997, are eligible for reappointment.

Nominations to replace Board members whose terms expire December 31, 1997, may be made by individuals, firms or associations. Nominations will:

- (1) State the region to be represented;
- (2) State whether the nominee is representing carriers, shippers or both;
- (3) Provide information on the nominee's personal qualifications;
- (4) Include the commercial operations of the carrier and/or shipper with whom the nominee is affiliated. This commercial operations information will show the actual or estimated ton-miles of each commodity carried or shipped

on the inland waterways system in a recent year (or years) using the waterway regions and commodity categories previously listed.

Nominations received in response to last year's **Federal Register** notice, published on July 10, 1996, have been retained for consideration. Renomination is not required but may be desirable.

Deadline for Nomination

All nominations must be received at the address shown above no later than August 31, 1996.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-17916 Filed 7-8-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-92-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Corps of Engineers

Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Evaluation of Proposed Placement of Dredged Material at Site 104, Chesapeake Bay, Queen Anne's County, MD

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Sections 313 and 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1977 (33 USC 1323 and 1344), the Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will evaluate the placement of dredged material at Site 104, Chesapeake Bay, Queen Anne's County, Maryland. Pursuant to Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Baltimore District will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Evaluation of the Proposed Placement of Dredged Material at Site 104, Chesapeake Bay, Queen Anne's County, Maryland. The dredged material to be placed at Site 104 would be clean material from Federal navigation channels in the main stem of the Chesapeake Bay leading to Baltimore Harbor and the Port of Baltimore. Site 104 is located in the main stem of the Chesapeake Bay, north of the William Preston Lane Jr. Memorial Bridge, and west of Kent Island and encompasses approximately 1,800 acres. The Section 404 Evaluation will investigate the use of alternative placement equipment and methods for the placement of approximately 18 million cubic yards of additional dredged material in the deepest part of the site. To facilitate the Evaluation, the Baltimore District will also prepare and

circulate an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) evaluating the suitability of Site 104 for placement of dredged material. The EIS will include descriptions of the existing site conditions, dredged material placement alternatives, probable impacts of dredged material placement, public involvement, and the recommended determination and/or activity. The scheduled completed date for the draft Section 404 Evaluation and EIS for the Proposed Placement of Dredged Material at Site 404, Chesapeake Bay, Queen Anne's County, Maryland is early 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions about the proposed action and EIS can be addressed to Mr. Mark Mendelsohn, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, ATTN: CENAB-PL-PC (104), P.O. Box 1715, Baltimore, MD 21203-1715, telephone 410-962-9499. E-Mail address: mark.mendelsohn@ccmail.nab.usace.army.mil

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Site 104 is located in the main stem of the Chesapeake Bay, north of the William Preston Lane Jr. Memorial Bridge, and west of Kent Island. The site was used for dredged material placement during a period of approximately 50 years, beginning in 1924 and ending in 1975. The original placement area extended 2.7 nautical miles, from its northern boundary northwest of Love Point (Kent Island), in a south southwestward direction along a natural deep channel of the Bay to a position due east of the Sandy Point Light. The southern boundaries of the site were extended twice to increase the length by about 1½ miles and the southern 1.1 nautical miles of the site were widened by approximately 1,000 feet, increasing the total acreage to approximately 1,800 acres. Records for the period are not complete, but suggest that during the thirty-year period ending in 1975 more than 70 million cubic yards of dredged material were placed at the site. These dredged sediments resulted from widening and deepening the project channels (at least 44 million cubic yards) and from maintenance dredging of the authorized channels (at least 26 million cubic yards).

2. The proposed open-water placement would use clean dredged material removed from Federal navigation channels in the main stem of the Chesapeake Bay leading to Baltimore Harbor and the Port of Baltimore. The specific channels to be dredged are Craighill Entrance, Craighill Channel, Craighill Upper Range, Cutoff Angle, Brewerton Channel Eastern

Extension, Swan Point Channel, Tolchester Channel, and the Approach Channel to the C&D Canal. Placement of approximately 18 million cubic yards would fill the deepest parts of the site to a depth of 45 feet MLLW.

3. Because different dredging and placement methods might carry significantly different water quality impacts, the Baltimore District will evaluate alternative dredged material placement equipment and methods. Information on the alternatives will be analyzed, a recommended placement plan formulated, and the results presented in the Section 404 Evaluation and the EIS. The District will prepare and circulate a draft EIS (DEIS) evaluating the suitability of Site 104 for placement of dredged material. The EIS will include descriptions of the existing site conditions, dredged material placement alternatives, probable impacts of dredged material placement, public involvement, and the recommended determination and/or activity.

4. The decision on the suitability of the proposed site for placement of clean dredged material described in this public notice will be based on an evaluation of the probable impact of the proposed activity on the public interest. The decision will reflect the national concern for the protection and utilization of important resources. The benefit which may reasonably be expected to accrue from the proposal must be balanced against its reasonably foreseeable detriments. All factors which may be relevant to the proposal will be considered; among these are conservation, economics, aesthetics, energy needs, general environmental concerns, fish and wildlife values, historic values, navigation, water quality, recreation, safety, food production, and in general, the needs and welfare of the people. Site 104 will not be found suitable for open-water placement of clean dredged material unless it's found to be in the public interest.

5. As part of the EIS public involvement process, the Baltimore District is conducting a scoping process to identify issues and areas of concern. Any person who has interest in the proposed placement of dredged material at Site 104, or who may be adversely affected by the proposed placement activity, may make comments or suggestions or request a public hearing. A series of three public meetings has been scheduled whereat concerned persons may comment or make suggestions. The time and dates for the three meetings are given below:

a. July 15, 1997 at 7:00 pm—Kent County Court House, Commissioners Hearing Room—First Floor, 103 North Cross Street, Chestertown, Maryland 21620.

b. July 17, 1997 at 7:00 pm—Queen Anne's County Office Building, Second Floor Meeting Room, 208 North Commerce Street, Centreville, Maryland 21617.

c. July 22, 1997 at 7:00 pm—Broadneck High School, 1265 Green Holly Drive, Annapolis, Maryland 21401.

6. Please communicate the foregoing information concerning the proposed work to any person known by you to be interested and, not being known to this office, does not receive a copy of this notice.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-17923 Filed 7-8-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-41-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Corps of Engineers

Intent To Prepare a Draft Supplement III to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay Project, Dare County, NC

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The navigation improvements being proposed are necessary to provide safe and reliable navigation through Oregon Inlet and are essentially the same as those previously coordinated, consisting of twin jetties at Oregon Inlet (with sand bypassing) and improvements to navigation channels to Wanchese, North Carolina. Supplement III will discuss recent changes in the design of the project and present refined impact analyses, which have been conducted since the circulation of Supplement II in 1985. On February 27, 1991, the NOI to prepare the Draft Supplement III to the FEIS appeared in the **Federal Register**. Due to funding and scheduling problems, the Draft Supplement III to the FEIS was not prepared at the time.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions about the proposed action and Draft Supplement III to the FEIS can be answered by: Mr. William F. Adams, Environmental Resources Section; U.S. Army Engineer District, Wilmington; Post Office Box 1890; Wilmington,