

4. Alternatives

- a—No Action: No improvement or reinforcement of existing banks or uplands to stabilize for sedimentation.
- b—Proposed Alternative Plans: None have been formulated to date.

5. Scoping Process

Participation of all interested Federal, State and County resource agencies, as well as Native American peoples, groups with environmental interests, and all interested individuals are encouraged. Public involvement will be most beneficial and worthwhile in identifying pertinent environmental issues, offering useful information such as published or unpublished data, direct personal experience or knowledge which inform decision making, assistance in defining the scope of plans which ought to be considered, and recommending suitable mitigation measures warranted by such plans. Those wishing to contribute information, ideas, alternatives for actions, and so forth can furnish these contributions in writing to the points of contacts indicated above, or by attending public scoping opportunities.

The scoping period will conclude 45 days after publication of this notice and simultaneous publication in newspapers circulated in the Big Bear Lake area (see DATES).

When plans have been devised, and alternatives formulated to embody those plans, potential impacts will be evaluated in the DEIS. These assessments will emphasize at least fourteen categories of resources: land use, impromptu historic landfills, hazardous wastes, physical environment, hydrology, groundwater, biological, archaeological, geological, air quality, noise, transportation, socioeconomic, and safety.

Luz D. Ortiz,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 03-25759 Filed 10-9-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-KF-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6644-5]

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 **Federal Register** dated April 04, 2003 (68 FR 16511).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-AFS-F65041-MN Rating EC2, Chippewa and Superior National Forests Land and Resource Management Plans Revision, Implementation, Beltrami, Cass, Itasca, Cook, Lake and St. Louis Counties, MN.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the management of watersheds, deer populations and invasive species. EPA recommended that the final EIS consider a preferred alternative that is a hybrid of those that were described in the Draft EIS.

ERP No. D-AFS-G65088-NM Rating LO, Bluewater Ecosystem Management Project, Proposal to Initiate Vegetation Treatments to Restore Ponderosa Pine and Pinon-Juniper Stands to a Desired Condition, Cibola National Forest, Mt. Taylor Ranger District, McKinley and Cibola Counties, NM.

Summary: EPA expressed a lack of objections to the selection of the preferred alternative.

ERP No. D-AFS-K26002-CA Rating LO, South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD) B-Line Phase III Wastewater Export Pipeline Replacement Project, Luther Pass Pump Station to U.S. Forest Service Luther Pass Overflow Campground Access Road, Special Use Permit, U.S. Army COE Section 404 and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Permits Issuance and EPA Grant, El Dorado and Alpine Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed a lack of objections.

ERP No. D-BLM-L65418-OR Rating EC2, Travis Tyrrell Seed Orchard Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program, Implementation, Eugene District, Lorne, Lane County, OR.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns and recommends that the final EIS discuss pesticide safety issues, additional IPM methodologies, and the relevancy of a concurrent BLM Draft Supplemental EIS (Management of Port-Orford-Cedar by Southwest Oregon) which BLM is working on that may impact proposed activities for the four seeds orchards. EPA also recommends that the final EIS discuss how the Washington Toxics Coalition, *et al.* vs U.S. EPA decision may affect the range of alternatives.

ERP No. D-BLM-L65425-OR Rating EC2, Provolt Seed Orchard Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program,

Implementation, Grants Pass, Medford District, Jackson and Josephine Counties, OR and Charles A. Sprague Seed Orchard Integrated Pest Management Program (IMP), Implementation, Merlin, Medford District, Josephine County, OR.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns and recommends that the Final EIS should discuss pesticide safety and additional IPM methodologies. Also, the Final EIS should discuss management actions that may be taken under the concurrent BLM Draft Supplemental EIS, Management of Port-Orford-Cedar, their potential impact on proposed activities for the four seed orchards.

ERP No. D-BLM-L65426-OR Rating EC2, Walter H. Horning Seed Orchard Integrated Pest Management Program (IPM), Implementation, Colton, Salem District, Clackamas County, OR.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns and recommends that the final EIS discuss pesticide safety issues, additional IPM methodologies, and the relevancy of a concurrent BLM Draft Supplemental EIS (Management of Port-Orford-Cedar by Southwest Oregon) which BLM is working on that may impact proposed activities for the four seed orchards. EPA also recommends that the final EIS discuss how the Washington Toxics Coalition, *et al.* vs U.S. EPA decision may affect the range of alternatives.

ERP No. D-FRC-C05148-NY Rating LO, St. Lawrence-FDR Hydroelectric Project, Application for New License (Relicense), (FERC No. 200-036), Located on the St. Lawrence River, Messina, NY.

Summary: EPA does not believe that the proposed project would result in significant adverse impacts to the environmental and cultural resources and has no objections to its implementation.

ERP No. D-IBR-K39079-CA Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—Environmental Water Account Project, Water Management Strategy to Protect the At-Risk Native Delta-Dependent Fish Species and Water Supply Improvements, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Endangered Species Act Section 7 and US Army Corps Section 10 Permits Issuance, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concern that the water project operations could reduce water quality. In addition the Draft EIS does not capture current evaluations regarding potential uses of the EWA and redefinition of EWA assets in conjunction with other proposed CALFED projects, such as South Delta Improvements. EPA recommended that