At the scoping meetings, FERC and TVA staff will: (1) Identify preliminary environmental issues related to the proposed project; (2) identify preliminary resource issues that are not important and do not require detailed analysis; (3) identify reasonable alternatives to be addressed in the EIS; (4) solicit from the meeting participants all available information, especially quantified data, on the resource issues; and (5) encourage statements from experts and the public on issues that should be analyzed in the EIS, including points of view in opposition to, or in support of, the staffs' preliminary views.

Persons choosing not to speak at the meetings, but who have views on the issues or information relevant to the issues, may submit written statements for inclusion in the public record at the meetings. In addition, written scoping comments may be filed with Lois Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20425, with Linda Oxendine, Senior Specialist, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, WT8C-K, Knoxville, TN 37902. All written correspondence should clearly show the following captions on the first page: Laurel Branch Pumped Storage Project, FERC Project No. 11499-000, and Reynolds Creek Pumped Storage Project, FERC Project No. 11500-000.

Site Visit

A site visit to the proposed project location is planned for Monday, August 5 at 2:00 p.m. CDT. Participants will gather at Dunlap, Tennessee. Please contact Jill Elmendorf at (423) 632–6592 no later than Thursday, August 1 for reservations and information.

Consultation With the State Historic Preservation Officer

With this notice, we are initiating consultation with the Tennessee State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), as required by § 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and the regulations of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 36 CFR 800.4.

Additional Scientific Study Requests

In accordance with Section 4.32(b)(7) of the FERC regulations, if any resource agency, SHPO, Indian Tribe, or person believes that an additional scientific study should be conducted in order to form an adequate, factual basis for complete analysis of these projects on its merits, they must file a request for the study with the FERC, together with justification for such request, not later than 60 days from the date of this notice

and serve a copy of the request on the potential applicant.

For Further Information on This Process, please contact Eddie R. Crouse, FERC, (202) 219–2794, or Linda Oxendine, TVA, (423) 632–3440. Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–17714 Filed 7–11–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. CP96-564-000]

National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Line K Relocation Project and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues

July 8, 1996.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental assessment (EA) that will discuss the environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the facility proposed in the Line K Relocation Project. This EA will be used by the Commission in its decision-making process to determine whether an environmental impact statement is necessary and whether to approve the project.

Summary of the Proposed Project

National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation (National Fuel) wants to construct about 877 feet of 20-inch-diameter pipeline to replace about 454 feet of Line K in Erie County, New York. Of this 454-foot-long segment of Line K, about 147 feet would be removed and 307 feet would be abandoned in place. National Fuel states that due to encroachment of residential development this segment of deteriorating Line K can not be replace in the same location.

The specific location of the project facility is shown in appendix 1.2

Land Requirements for Construction

Construction of the proposed facility would require about 0.99 acre of land. Following construction, about 0.60 acre would be maintained as permanent right-of-way. The remaining 0.33 acre would be restored and allowed to revert to its former use.

The EA Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. We call the "scoping". The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this Notice of Intent, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the EA. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EA. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

The EA will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed project under these general headings:

- geology and soils
- water resources, fisheries, and wetlands
- vegetation and wildlife
- endangered and threatened species
- land use
- cultural resources
- hazardous waste
- · public safety

We will also evaluate possible alternatives to the proposed project or portions of the project, and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

Our independent analysis of the issues will be in the EA. Depending on the comments received during the scoping process, the EA may be published and mailed to Federal, state, and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, affected landowners, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list for this proceeding. A comment period will be allotted for review if the EA is published. We will consider all comments on the EA before we recommend that the Commission approve or not approve the project.

Currently Identified Environmental Issues

We have already identified several issues that we think deserve attention based on a preliminary review of the proposed facility and the environmental information provided by National Fuel. This preliminary list of issues may be

¹ National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation's application was filed with the Commission under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations.

² The appendices referenced in this notice are not being printed in the Federal Register. Copies are available from the Commission's Public Reference and Files Maintenance Branch, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, or call (202) 208–1371. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail.

changed based on your comments and our analysis:

- Three residences are located within 50 feet of the construction right-of-way.
- The entire project lies within a residential area.

Public Participation

You can make a difference by sending a letter addressing your specific comments or concerns about the project. You should focus on the potential environmental effects of the proposal, alternatives to the proposal including alternative routes, and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. Please follow the instructions below to ensure that your comments are received and properly recorded:

- Address your letter to: Lois Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First St., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426;
- Reference Docket No. CP96–564–
- Send a *copy* of your letter to: Mrs. Medha Kochhar, EA Project Manager, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First St., N.E., PR-11.2, Washington, D.C. 20426; and
- Mail your comments so that they will be received in Washington, D.C. on or before August 12, 1996.

If you wish to receive a copy of the EA, you should request one from Mrs. Medha Kochhar at the above address.

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, you may want to become an official party to the proceeding or become an "intervenor". Among other things, intervenors have the right to receive copies of caserelated Commission documents and filings by other intervenors. Likewise, each intervenor must provide copies of its filings to all other parties. If you want to become an intervenor you must file a motion to intervene according to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214) (see appendix 2).

You do not need intervenor status to have your scoping comments considered.

Additional information about the proposed project is available from Mrs. Medha Kochbar, EA Project Manager, at (202) 208–2270.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–17713 Filed 7–11–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-5471-3]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared June 24, 1996 Through June 28, 1996 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 05, 1996 (61 FR 15251).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-APH-A99207-00 Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—Veterinary Services (VS) Programs, Implementation, to Detect, Prevent, Control, and Eradicate Domestic and Foreign Animal Diseases and Pests, All 50 States and the United States Territories.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the program regarding contamination of ground water from carcass disposal and issues concerning pesticide use. EPA suggested that the final EIS include additional alternatives and assessment of their impacts, consideration of mitigation of chemical use, applicator training requirements, and several changes to inaccuracies pertaining to pesticide use.

ERP No. D-COE-F35042-IN Rating EC2, Indiana Harbor and Canal Dredging and Confined Disposal Facility, Construction and Operation, Comprehensive Management Plan, East Chicago, Lake County, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding dredging depth impacts to water quality, cumulative impacts, and TSCA and RCRA issues. EPA requested that additional information be provided in the final EIS to address these issues.

ERP No. FRC-L05216-WA Rating EU3, Cushman Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 460), Relicensing, North Fork Skokomish River, Mason County, WA.

Summary: EPA's review concluded that the proposed alternative is environmentally unsatisfactory. In addition, EPA has significant concerns regarding the adequacy of the draft EIS. In particular, the draft EIS does not (1) provide a comprehensive analysis of cumulative impacts; (2) appropriately

characterize the no-action alternative; (3) assess impacts on Tribal Trust/ Treaty resources; (4) give equal consideration to power and nonpar values when assessing project "benefits"; and (5) provide sufficient information and support conclusions regarding alternatives and mitigation measures, especially with regard to restoration of more natural flows to the North Fork Skokomish River. EPA noted that if this proposal is carried forward to the final EIS without correcting unacceptable impacts, it will be a candidate for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality.

ERP No. D-IBR-K39043-CA Rating EU3, American River Water Resources Investigation, Implementation, Placer, Suter, EL Dorado, Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA's review concluded that one of the alternatives, the proposed Auburn Dam on the American River, is environmentally unsatisfactory. EPA noted that if this proposal is carried forward to the Final EIS without correcting unacceptable impacts, it will be a candidate for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality. EPA urged the Bureau of Reclamation and other program sponsors to pursue development of a non-Auburn Dam alternative which modifies elements of the Conjunctive Use alternative to guarantee adequate instream flows and Bay/Delta outflow.

ERP No. D-USN-A11073-00 Rating EC2, United States Navy Shipboard Solid Waste Disposal, Implementation, MARPOL Special Areas: Designated Baltic Sea, North Sea, Wilder Caribbean, Antarctic Ocean, Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea and Red Sea, Gulfs Region: Persian Gulf and Gulf of Oman.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns for additional measures to protect special resources (e.g., coral reefs) and to ensure that future designs of ships provide for storage space for wastes; EPA also requested additional impacts analysis and clarification regarding planned actions in the Baltic Sea, the North Sea and Antarctic Waters.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-COE-E30036-MS Coldwater River Watershed Demonstration Erosion Control Project, Flood and Sediment Control Measures, Implementation, Yazoo Basin, Marshall, Benton and Tate Counties, MS.

Summary: EPA had no significant environmental objections with implementation of the proposed flood control measures. No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.