During the course of the Kansas City workshop, discussion of the above-listed cases could arise. Any person having an interest in an above-listed case is invited to attend the Kansas City workshop. There will be no Commission transcript of any of the workshops, and information discussion or disseminated in the workshop will not constitute part of the decisional record in the above-listed cases, unless formally, filed in accordance with Commission Regulations.

#### David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–7315 Filed 3–23–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6252-5]

## Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared March 6, 2000 Through March 10, 2000 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 9, 1999 (63 FR 17856).

## **Draft EISs**

ERP No. D-AFS-L65342-00 Rating EC2, Pacific Northwest Region Douglas-fir Tussock Moth (orgvia pseudotsugata) Project, To Partially Control an Anticipated Outbreak of Douglas-fir tussock moth, To be Implemented in Nine National Forests in WA and OH.

## Summary

EPA expressed concerns about the EIS lacking a clear demonstration that defoliation by tussock moths would adversely affect the environment. EPA also urged that the EIS apply the protocol for addressing 303(d) waters, discuss further the IPM approach used, and describe the indicators that would trigger spraying.

ERP No. Ď–COE–G36151–TX Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—Upper Trinity River Basin Feasibility Study, To Provide Flood Damage Reduction, Environmental Restoration, Water Quality Improvement and Recreational Enhancement, Trinity River, Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex, Dallas, Denton and Tarrant Counties, TX.

#### Summary

EPA has environmental concerns about water quality. EPA requested additional information regarding optimum channel and lake morphology to ensure safe and recreational use compatible with water quality within the lakes. EPA also requested additional information regarding the Dallas Master Plan's compatibility with Floodplain Management requirements established by Executive Order 11988.

ERP No. D–NRS–A36450–00 Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—Emergency Watershed Protection Program, Improvements and Expansion, To Preserve Life and Property Threatened by Disaster-Caused Erosion and Flooding, US 50 States and Territories except Coastal Area.

## Summary

EPA expressed concern that the "Prioritized Watershed Planning and Management" alternative was not selected as the proposed action. EPA requested several modifications to the proposed program, including requirements for cumulative impact assessment and greater use of bioengineering principles when designing projects.

#### **Final EISs**

ERP No. F–AFS–J65314–MT, Flathead National Forest, Swan Lake Ranger District, Meadow Smith Project, Vegetative Treatments and Other Activities to Maintain and Restore Large-Tree Old Grow Forest Characteristics, Lake and Missoula Counties, MT.

#### Summary

EPA continues to express concern about the level of monitoring proposed to identify actual impacts from the implementation activities. EPA also requested additional mitigation measures to reduce other impacts.

ERP No. F–BLM–K67050–NV, South Pipeline Mine Project, Proposal to Extend Gold Mining Operations, Implementation, Lander County, NV.

# Summary

EPA continues to express concern regarding air/water quality impacts and the ecological risk of pit lakes. EPA requested that BLM address these issues before the Record of Decision is signed.

ERP No. F–COE–C32035–00, New York and New Jersey Harbor Navigation Study, Identify, Screen and Select Navigation Channel Improvements, NY and NJ.

#### Summary

EPA's previous issues concerning the lack of a signed Memorandum of Understanding for the Comprehensive Port Improvement Plan (CPIP), the cumulative impacts analysis, and the no action alternative have been adequately addressed. EPA requested that air quality analyses be committed to in the Record of Decision for this project and completed prior to project implementation. EPA expressed concerns that until the CPIP is completed, impacts associated with port facility and infrastructure expansions will not have been addressed. EPA commented that a supplemental EIS for the Harbor Navigation Project may be required at some point in the future.

ÊRP No. F–DOÉ–G60007–NM, The Conveyance and Transfer of Certain Land Tracts Administered by the US DOE and Located at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos and Santa Fe Counties, NM.

## Summary

EPA has no objection to the action as proposed.

Dated: March 21, 2000.

#### B. Katherine Biggs,

Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division Office of Federal Activities. [FR Doc. 00–7348 Filed 3–23–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### [ER-FRL-6252-4]

# **Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability**

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 OR www.epa.gov/oeca/ofa. Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements

Filed March 13, 2000 Through March 17, 2000

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 000078, Final EIS, SFW, ID, MT, Grizzly Bear (Ursus arctos horribilus) Recovery Plan in the Bitterroot Ecosystem, Implementation, Endangered Species Act, Proposed Special Rule 10(j) Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bears in the Bitterroot Area, Rocky Mountain, Blaine, Camas, Boise, Clearwater, Custer, Elmore, Idaho, Lemhi, Shoshone, Due: April 24, 2000, Contact: Dr. Christopher Servheen (406) 243–4903.

EIS No. 000079, Draft EIS, FHW, VA, Coalfields Expressway Location Study, Improvements from Route 23 near Pound, VA to the WV State Line east of Slate, VA, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, Wise, Dickerson and Buchanan, VA, Due: May 12, 2000, Contact: Roberto Forseca-Martinez (804) 775–3320.

#### **Amended Notices**

EIS No. 000001, Draft EIS, SFW, WA, Tacoma Water Green River Water Supply Operations and Watershed Protection Habitat Conservation Plan, Implementation, Issuance of a Multiple Species Permit for Incidental Take, King County, WA, Due: March 31, 2000, Contact: Tim Romanski (360) 753–5823. Published FR on 1– 14–2000: CEQ Comment Date has been extended from 03/14/2000 to 03/ 31/2000.

EIS No. 000062, Final EIS, OSM, TN, Fall Creek Falls Petition Evaluation Document, Implementation, Designate the Land as Unsuitable for Surface Coal Mining Operation, Van Buren and Bledsoe Counties, TN, Due: May 03, 2000, Contact: Sam K. Bae (202) 208–2633. Published FR on 3–03–2000: CEQ Comment Date has been extended from 04/03/2000 to 05/03/2000.

EIS No. 000074, Draft EIS, AFS, CO, Upper Blue Stewardship Project, Implementation of Vegetation Management, Travel Management, Designation of Dispersed Camping Sites, White River National Forest, Dillon Ranger District, Summit County, CO, Due: May 01, 2000, Contact: Kathleen Phelps (970) 468–5400. Published FR–3–17–00—Correction to Comment Period from 5–12–2000 to 5–1–2000 and Correction to Title.

Dated: March 21, 2000.

#### B. Katherine Biggs,

Associate Director, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 00–7349 Filed 3–23–00; 8:45 am]

# **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[FRL-6563-6]

Proposed Past Cost Settlement Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as Amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act—Golden, CO

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the requirements in section 122(i)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), notice is hereby given of a proposed past cost settlement under section 122(h), concerning the Colorado School of Mines Research Institute site in Golden, Colorado (Site). The proposed Administrative Order on Consent (AOC) requires several Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs), including Federal PRPs to pay an aggregate total of \$871,000 to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) related to response actions taken at the Site.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted by April 24, 2000.

ADDRESSES: The proposed settlement is available for public inspection at the EPA Superfund Record Center, 999 18th Street, 5th Floor, North Tower, Denver, Colorado. Comments should be addressed to Kelcey Land, Enforcement Specialist, (8ENF-T), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado, 80202–2405, and should reference the Colorado School of Mines Research Institute Past Cost Settlement (EPA Docket No. CERCLA-8–2000–7).

# **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kelcey Land, Enforcement Specialist, at (303) 312–6393.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Notice of section 122(h) past cost settlement: In accordance with section 122(i)(1) of CERCLA, notice is hereby given that the terms of an Administrative Order on Consent (AOC) has been agreed to by the following parties:

The PRPs include: ASARCO Inc., BP America, Inc., Cotter Corporation, Cyprus Amax Minerals Company, El Paso Natural Gas Company, Elf Aquitane, Inc. on behalf of several Texasgulf companies, ExxonMobil Coal and Minerals Company, N.L. Industries, Inc., Inspiration Consolidated Copper Company, Phelps Dodge Corporation, Terra Industries, Inc., and Western Nuclear, Inc. as well as several affiliates of these companies, all of whom are listed in Attachment A of the agreement. The private PRPs paid a total of \$480,993.48.

Several federal PRPs were also identified at the site, however only the Bureau of Mines is a signatory to the agreement. The United States paid a total of \$390,006.52 in settlement of the claims against all federal entities.

By the terms of the proposed AOC, these parties will together pay \$871,000

to the Hazardous Substance Superfund. This payment along with the \$1.056 million reimbursement via the de minimis settlements constitutes approximately a 93% settlement of all EPA's costs at the site.

In exchange for payment, EPA will provide the settling parties with a limited covenant not to sue for liability under section 107(a) of CERCLA, which includes liability for EPA's past costs and contribution protection for EPA's past costs and other past costs incurred before and including May 31, 1997. The covenants and contribution protection also extends to Colorado School of Mines (CSM), Colorado School of Mines Research Institute (CSMRI), and the State of Colorado who are also signatories to the agreement. The only other past costs known at this time were incurred by the signatories to the agreement.

For a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, the public may submit comments to EPA relating to this proposed past cost settlement.

A copy of the proposed AOC may be obtained from Kelcey Land (8ENF–T), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, 999 18th Street, Suite 5000, Colorado 80202–2405, (303) 312–6393. Additional background information relating to the proposed cost settlement is available for review at the Superfund Records Center at the above address.

It is So Agreed.

## Jack W. McGraw,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII. [FR Doc. 00–7328 Filed 3–23–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6564-4]

Announcement of Schedule for Resource Conservation & Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action Guidance Documents and Request for Feedback on RCRA Cleanup Reforms

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: The intent of this notice is to announce a schedule and invite comment on three upcoming RCRA Cleanup Reforms draft guidance documents and invite additional feedback on the Resource Conservation & Recovery Act (RCRA) Cleanup Reforms announced on July 8, 1999. By inviting additional feedback and giving advanced notice of when we expect these draft guidance documents to be