

Coos Bay, Medford, and Roseburg Bureau of Land Management districts and the Siskiyou National Forest, Southwest Oregon, comment period ends: September 12, 2003, contact: Ken Denton (503) 326-2368. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service and the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management are joint lead agencies on the above project. This document is available on the Internet at http://www.or.blm.gov/planning/Port-Orford-Cedar_SEIS/.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 030154, Draft EIS, FHW, UT, Southern Corridor, extending from I-15 at reference post 2 in St. George to UT-9 near Hurricane, Endangered Species Act review section 7, right-of-way and U.S. Army Corps section 404 permits, St. George, Washington and Hurricane, Washington County, UT, comment period ends: July 11, 2003, contact: Gregory Punske (801)963-0182. Revision of FR notice published on 4/11/2003: CEQ comment period ending 5/30/2003 has been extended to 7/11/2003.

Dated: June 10, 2003.

Joseph C. Montgomery,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 03-15011 Filed 6-12-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-5541-1]

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 4, 2003 (68 FR 16511).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-AFS-J65379-CO Rating EC2, Green Ridge Mountain Pine Beetle Analysis Project, Proposal to Reduce the Spread of Mountain Pine Beetle and Associated Tree Mortality, Medicine Bow-Routt National Forest & Thunder Basin National Grassland, Parks Ranger District, Jackson County, CO.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with harvest activities and road construction because of potential adverse impacts to aquatic resources and contiguous terrestrial habitat. The final EIS should include additional information regarding the use of adaptive management techniques, mitigation measures for soil compaction, habitat fragmentation and impacts from new roads.

ERP No. D-COE-F36164-IL Rating LO, Programmatic EIS—East St. Louis and Vicinity, Illinois Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Damage Reduction Project, Implementation, Madison and St. Clair Counties, IL.

Summary: EPA has no objections to this multi-objective, multi-agency ecological restoration and flood control project.

ERP No. D-COE-K36136-CA Rating EC2, Lower Cache Creek Flood Damage Reduction Project, Implementation, City of Woodland and Vicinity, Yolo County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the project's lack of integration and consistency with the Sacramento/San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study, impacts on sediment loading, air quality, water quality and transportation, as well as direct impacts from future operation and maintenance of existing levees, risks from reasonably foreseeable flooding and the costs of residual flood risk.

ERP No. D-COE-K39077-CA Rating LO, East Cliff Drive Bluff Protection and Parkway Project, Alternatives Evaluation for Coastal Bluff Erosion Protection, City of Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz County, CA.

Summary: EPA has a lack of objections to this project. EPA provided recommendations to ensure full disclosure of potential PM2.5 and ozone air quality effects, other potential mitigation measures for visual impacts and project costs.

ERP No. D-FRC-G03020-LA Rating EC2, Hackberry Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Terminal and Natural Gas Pipeline Facilities, Construction and Operation, Cameron, Calcasieu, and Beauregard Parishes, LA

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns over potential impacts and requested that additional information be provided in the FEIS. Additional information requested included analyses of air quality impacts, availability of alternatives and cumulative impacts.

ERP No. D-FRC-K05228-CA Rating EC2, Pit 3, 4, 5 Hydroelectric Project, (FERC No. 233-081), Application for New License, Pit River, Pit River Basin,

Shasta-Trinity National Forest and Lassen National Forest, Shasta County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding impacts to water quality and cultural resources. EPA also requested additional information on impacts of minimum flow on aquatic resources and measures for avoiding the use of herbicides to control noxious weeds.

ERP No. D-SFW-K91011-CA Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—San Francisco Estuary Invasive Spartina Project, Spartina Control Program to Preserve and Restore Ecological Integrity of the Estuary's Intertidal Habitats, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco and San Mateo, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns and recommended the PFEIS include additional evaluation and disclosure of Clean Water Act Section 404 requirements; mitigation measures for biological resources and visual effects; the program approach for managing dredged material reuse, outside seed sources of Spartina, peer reviews, and funding; cumulative impacts and Endangered Species Act section 7 consultation.

ERP No. D-TVA-E29001-TN Rating EC2, Rarity Pointe Commercial Recreation and Residential Development on Tellico Reservoir Project, Request for TVA's Land and Approval of Water Use Facilities, Tellico Reservoir, Loudon County, TN.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding water quality impacts for the Tellico Reservoir.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-COE-E30040-FL Lee County Beach Erosion Control Project, Shore Protection, Gasparilla and Estero Islands, Lee County, FL.

Summary: EPA has no objections to the proposed project.

ERP NO. F-FRC-D03004-00 Greenbrier Pipeline Project, (Docket Nos. CPO 2-396-000 and PF 01-1-00), Proposal to Construct and Operate a Natural Gas Pipeline and Associated Above Ground Facilities extending from east of Clendenin, Kanawha County, WV, VA and Granville County, NC.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the proposed project, including wetlands losses. In light of the potential loss of wetlands, EPA also requested additional information regarding the proposed wetlands mitigation plan.

ERP No. F-FRC-L05225-OR North Umpqua Hydroelectric Project (FERC Project 1927), New License Issuance for

the existing 185.5-megawatt (MW) Facility, North Umpqua River, Douglas County, OR.

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

ERP No. F-FRC-L05228-ID Bear River Hydroelectric Project, Application for a New License for Three Existing Hydroelectric Projects: Soda (FERC No. 20-019), Grace-Cove (FERC No. 2401-007) and, Oneida (FERC No. 472-017) Bear River Basin, Caribou and Franklin Counties, ID.

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

ERP No. F-SFW-K64021-CA Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan, Issuance of Incidental Take Permit and the Adoption of an Implementing Agreement or Agreements, Natomas Basin, Sacramento and Sutter Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed continuing environmental concerns regarding the mitigation ratio and cumulative effects analysis. EPA recommended the ROD summarize the scientific basis for the 0.5:1 mitigation ratio, include a table demonstrating that the habitat values of habitats lost and conserved are equivalent, include a commitment to and list of all other mitigation requirements, and summarize cumulative impacts. EPA also recommended that the ROD address triggers for new effects analysis or revisions to the Natomas Basin HCP and ITPs, and possible suspension of applicable ITPs.

Dated: June 10, 2003.

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

[FR Doc. 03-15012 Filed 6-12-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7512-6]

Public Notice of Final National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges From Federal Facility Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) in Colorado

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of issuance of NPDES general permit.

SUMMARY: Region VIII of EPA is hereby giving notice of its issuance of the NPDES general permit for storm water discharges from regulated small municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s). This general permit will apply to federal facilities in urbanized areas (as defined by the 2000 U.S. Census) in the State of Colorado that apply for coverage under this permit. The federal facilities that EPA currently knows to exist in urbanized areas in Colorado, all of which have applied for coverage under this permit, include: Fort Carson; the General Services Administration's Denver Federal Center; Peterson Air Force Base; the U.S. Air Force Academy; the U.S. Department of Commerce—National Institute of Standards and Technology, Boulder Campus; the U.S.

Bureau of Prisons Federal Correctional Institution, Englewood; and the Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Denver. Additional federal facilities may need to apply for permit coverage at a later date if justified by subsequent Census data.

NPDES permit coverage is required for small MS4s in accordance with final EPA regulations for Phase II storm water discharges (64 FR 68722, December 8, 1999). Operators of Phase II-designated small MS4s (regulated small MS4s) are required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to EPA Region VIII to be covered under the general permit. In accordance with the general permit, each regulated small MS4 operator must develop, implement, and enforce a program designed to reduce the discharge of pollutants from its MS4 to the maximum extent practicable (MEP) to protect water quality and to satisfy the appropriate water quality requirements of the Clean Water Act. The small MS4 program must include the following six minimum control measures: Public education and outreach; public involvement and participation; illicit discharge detection and elimination; construction site runoff control; post-construction runoff control; and pollution prevention/good housekeeping. The permit assumes the use of narrative, rather than numeric, effluent limitations achieved through the implementation of best management practices (BMPs). Operators must establish BMPs and measurable goals for each minimum measure in the permit application. However, applicants will have up to five years to fully develop and implement their storm water management programs.

State	Permit No.	Areas covered by the general permit
Colorado	COR042000	Federal Facilities in the State of Colorado, except those located in Indian Country

DATES: The general permit becomes effective on June 13, 2003, and will expire five years from that date. For appeal purposes, the 120 day time period for appeal to the U.S. Federal Courts will begin on June 13, 2003.

ADDRESSES: The general permit and other related documents in the administrative record are on file in the EPA Region VIII NPDES file room and may be inspected upon request any time between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. Requests to view these files in the Region VIII NPDES file room should be made to Greg Davis (8EPR-EP); U.S. EPA, Region VIII; 999 18th Street, Suite

300; Denver, CO 80202-2466, by phone at 303-312-6082, or by E-mail at davis.gregory@epa.gov. Copies of the general permit and fact sheet may also be downloaded from the EPA Region VIII Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/region8/water/stormwater/downloads.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Questions regarding the specific permit requirements may be directed to Greg Davis, telephone (303) 312-6082, or E-mail at davis.gregory@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA Region VIII proposed and solicited comments on the general permit at 68

FR 8902 (February 26, 2003). In addition, EPA Region VIII sent notices and copies of the draft general permit and fact sheet to the seven Federal Facilities designated for permit coverage. EPA did not receive any comments on the draft general permit. Region VIII is not issuing NPDES General Permits for Storm Water Discharges from Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) located in Indian country. No MS4s in Indian country have been determined to require small MS4 permit coverage at this time.

Appeal of Permit: Any interested person may appeal the "NPDES General