

the city of Livermore between Livermore and Tracy, California.

The alternatives evaluated in the Draft LLNL SW/SPEIS represent a range of operation from the minimum level that maintains core capabilities (Reduced Operation Alternative) to the highest reasonable activity levels that could be supported by current facilities, plus the potential expansion and construction of new facilities for specifically identified future actions (Proposed Action). The No Action Alternative would continue operation of current LLNL programs in support of assigned missions and includes approved interim actions and facility construction, expansion or modification, and decontamination and decommissioning for which NEPA analysis and documentation already exists. All alternatives assume LLNL will continue to operate as an NNSA national laboratory. However, the Reduced Operation Alternative includes an overall reduction of LLNL activities to a level that would prevent LLNL from accomplishing the full scope of the currently assigned NNSA Stockpile Stewardship Program missions. The Proposed Action includes operations discussed under the No Action Alternative plus new and/or expanded LLNL operations in support of future mission requirements.

Use of Proposed Materials on the National Ignition Facility

Paragraph 6 of the Memorandum Opinion and Order issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on August 19, 1998 in *NRDC v. Pena*, Civ. No. 97-936 (SS) (D.D.C.), provides that:

No later than January 1, 2004, DOE shall (1) determine whether any or all experiments using plutonium, other fissile materials, fissionable materials other than depleted uranium (as discussed in the Supplement Analysis for the Use of Hazardous Materials in NIF experiments, A.R. doc. VII.A-12), lithium hydride, or a Neutron Multiplying Assembly (NEUMA), such as that described in the document entitled Nuclear Weapons Effects Test Facilitization of the National Ignition Facility (A.R. doc. VII.A-4) shall be conducted in the NIF, or (2) prepare a Supplemental SSM PEIS, in accordance with DOE NEPA regulation 10 CFR § 1021.314, analyzing the reasonably foreseeable environmental impact of such experiments.

In November 2002, the NNSA proposed experiments on the National Ignition Facility (NIF) using plutonium, other fissile materials, fissionable materials, and lithium hydride. The Draft LLNL SW/SPEIS analyzes the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts of these experiments. There is no NNSA proposal to use a NEUMA. In the Record of Decision, NNSA will

address decisions on the use of any or all of these proposed materials in NIF experiments within the context of continuing LLNL operations.

After the end of the public comment period which ends on May 27, 2004, the NNSA will consider and respond to the comments received, revise the Draft LLNL SW/SPEIS as appropriate, and issue the Final LLNL SW/SPIES. The NNSA will consider the analysis in the Final LLNL SW/SPEIS, along with other information, in making a decision on the operation of the LLNL.

Issued in Washington, DC, this 30th day of January 2004.

Linton F. Brooks,

Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration.

[FR Doc. 04-4358 Filed 2-26-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7627-5]

National Drinking Water Advisory Council; Request for Water Security Working Group Nominations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or Agency) is announcing the formation of the Water Security Working Group (WSWG) of the National Drinking Water Advisory Council, and soliciting all interested persons to nominate qualified individuals to serve a one-year term. Any interested person or organization may nominate qualified individuals for membership on the working group.

Background: Homeland Security Presidential Directive 7 designates EPA as the sector-specific agency for the security of the nation's drinking water and wastewater sectors. In order to assist the water sector in becoming more secure against malevolent threats, the Agency is facilitating the development of voluntary best security practices and policies for drinking water and wastewater facilities. The National Drinking Water Advisory Council (NDWAC), established under the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 300f *et seq.*), provides practical and independent advice, consultation and recommendations to the Agency on the activities, functions and policies related to the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act. On February 10, 2004, NDWAC voted on and approved the formation of the Water

Security Working Group. After this working group completes their charge, they will make recommendations to the full NDWAC. The full NDWAC will in turn, make appropriate recommendations to the EPA. For a general description of the working group charge, the criteria for selecting working group members, and the specific directions for submitting working group member nominations, please see the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

DATES: Submit nominations via U.S. mail on or before March 29, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Address all nominations to Marc Santora, Designated Federal Officer, National Drinking Water Advisory Council Water Security Working Group, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, Water Security Division (Mail Code 4601-M), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: E-mail your questions to Marc Santora, Designated Federal Officer, santora.marc@epa.gov, or call 202-564-1597.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Working Group Charge: The charge for the Water Security Working Group (WSWG) is to provide recommendations to the full NDWAC that: (1) Identify, compile, and characterize best security practices and policies for drinking water and wastewater utilities and provide an approach for considering and adopting these practices and policies at a utility level; (2) consider mechanisms to provide recognition and incentives that facilitate a broad and receptive response among the water sector to implement these best security practices and policies, and make recommendations as appropriate; (3) consider mechanisms to measure the extent of implementation of these best security practices and policies, identify the impediments of their implementation, and make recommendations as appropriate.

Selection Criteria: The criteria for selecting WSWG members are as follows: the WSWG members are recognized experts in their fields; the WSWG members are as impartial and objective as possible; the WSWG members collectively represent an array of backgrounds and perspectives within the water sector and related disciplines (e.g. public health, emergency response); and the WSWG members are available to fully participate in the working group. The schedule remains flexible, however, it is estimated that WSWG's meetings will be convened by spring of 2004 and will be conducted

over a relatively short time frame, approximately one (1) year. Over the course of this period, WSWG members will be asked to attend a series of meetings, a maximum of five (5), participate in conference calls and video conferencing as necessary, participate in the discussion of key issues at all meetings, and review and finalize the products and outputs of the working group. The EPA is looking to create a diverse WSWG. Potential WSWG nominations could include individuals from the wastewater and drinking water industries, stakeholder organizations, state and local officials, public health officials, environmental organizations, emergency first responders, and security experts. The Agency is looking for a range of industry representation in terms of the size of the population served, as well as investor and publicly owned and operated facilities. This is not an exhaustive list; it is only intended to provide a framework to consider potential nominees.

Nomination of a Member: Any interested person or organization may nominate qualified individuals for membership to the working group. Name, occupation, position, address, and telephone number should identify all nominees. To be considered, all nominations must include a current resume providing the nominee's background, experience and qualifications, in addition to a statement (not to exceed two 2 paragraphs) about their particular expertise and interest in water security. Please note that the Agency will not formally acknowledge or respond to nominations.

Dated: February 24, 2004.

Cynthia C. Dougherty,

Director, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water.

[FR Doc. 04-4387 Filed 2-26-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6648-8]

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 04, 2003 (68 FR 16511).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-COE-E39063-NC Rating EC2, Bogus Inlet Channel Erosion Response Project, Relocation of the Main Ebb Channel to Eliminate the Erosive Impact to the Town of Emerald Isle, Carteret and Onslow Counties, NC.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the proposal to establish a given channel alignment and beach profile in a dynamic nearshore ecosystem.

ERP No. D-FHW-E40801-NC Rating EC2, US 74 Improvements Corridor, between U.S. 601, north of Monroe in Union County and I-485 (Charlotte Outer Loop), Funding and U.S. Army COE Section 404 Permit Issuance, Mecklenburg and Union Counties, NC.

Summary: EPA has environmental concerns with the proposed project regarding stream and water quality impacts, noise receptor impacts, upland forest communities and terrestrial wildlife, endangered species, agricultural land impacts and air quality. Additionally, EPA also has concerns about indirect and cumulative impacts from induced development effecting natural resources.

ERP No. D-FHW-F40419-MN Rating EC2, MN-371 North Improvement Project, Reconstruction from the Intersection of Crow Wing County Road 18 in Nisswa to the Intersection of Cass County Road 42 in Pine River, Funding, NPDES Permit and U.S. Army COE Section 404 Permit Issuance, Crow Wing and Cass Counties, MN.

Summary: EPA has environmental concerns with the proposed project regarding wetland mitigation, wetland impacts, noise monitoring, water quality, and cumulative and indirect impacts.

ERP No. D-FHW-L40220-OR Rating EC2, Pioneer Mountain to Eddyville Project on U.S. 20, Corvallis-Newport Highway Improvements, Funding, Right-of-Way Grant and U.S. Army COE Section 404 Permit Issuance, Lincoln County, OR.

Summary: EPA has environmental concerns with the proposed project regarding the range of alternatives evaluated in the EIS, potential impacts to headwater streams and terrestrial wildlife, and the design of the conceptual mitigation plan. EPA recommends that additional information related to these topics be included in the final EIS, along with information related to wildlife crossings, the

disposition of the present highway, and cuts and fills.

ERP No. DB-COE-E34030-FL Rating LO, Central and Southern Florida Project, Indian River Lagoon—South Feasibility Study, to Address the Requirement of section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act 2000 and Three Additional Alternatives, Martin, St. Lucie and Okeechobee Counties, FL.

Summary: EPA continues to fully support the project goals and recommended that water quality elements be maximized in these restoration efforts.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-AFS-J65386-MT, Programmatic EIS—Winter Motorized Recreation Amendment 24, Proposal to Change the Flathead National Land and Resource Management Plan, Flathead National Forest, Flathead, Lake and Lincoln Counties, MT.

Summary: EPA continues to express environmental concerns that the preferred alternative potentially decreases protections to grizzly bear security compared with other alternatives meeting the purpose and need. EPA suggested mitigation for potential impacts to air quality and human health in areas of concentrated use.

ERP No. F-BLM-G70005-NM, Sierra and Otero Counties Resource Management Plan Amendment and Federal Fluid Minerals Leasing and Development, Implementation, Sierra and Otero Counties, NM.

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

ERP No. F-COE-E30042-FL, Broward County Shore Protection Project, Fill Placement in Segment II (Hillsboro Inlet to Port Everglades) and Segment III (Port Everglades to the south County Line), Broward County, FL.

Summary: While EPA has no objections to the beach nourishment proposal, EPA did suggest further turbidity control measures in areas adjacent to hardbottom resources and recommended that the Record of Decision outline the consequences when all practicable sources of sand have been expended.

ERP No. F-COE-K32012-CA, San Diego Harbor Deepening (Central Navigation Channel) Involving Three Components: Federal Central Navigation Channel Deepening, Disposal of the Dredged Material at the LA-5 Ocean Disposal Site and Relocation and Disposal and Abandonment of a 69 kV Electrical Site, San Diego County.

Summary: While EPA found that the final EIS adequately addressed many of the issues raised in EPA's comment