

supporting infrastructure and facilities in the EIS.

The Facility would eliminate process wastewater entirely through use of water treatment, recycling, and zero liquid discharge systems. Solid waste (slag) and sulfur, by-products from the process, would be sold as a commercial product, disposed of onsite, or transported offsite for disposal at a non-hazardous, solid waste landfill. The construction work force would peak at up to 1,500 construction workers over a 4-year period. The Facility would be operated and maintained by a staff of approximately 145 employees and contractors.

Coal gasification and electric generation components of the Facility would be constructed on approximately 70 acres of the site. The site is currently used for agriculture (row crops), is surrounded by farmland, and is zoned for industrial and agricultural use. The coal gasification and electric generation components of the Facility are entirely within property that is zoned for industrial use. In addition, several hundred acres of Prime Farmland within the 886-acre parcel could be affected by the construction of the Facility. Preliminary assessments indicate that the footprint of the proposed facility would not affect any wetlands or floodplains. In the event that further analysis indicates that wetlands or floodplains would be affected, DOE will prepare a floodplain and wetland assessment in accordance with its regulations at 10 CFR part 1022 and include the assessment in the EIS.

Alternatives

In determining the range of reasonable alternatives to be considered in the EIS for the proposed CCG Facility, DOE identified the reasonable alternatives that would satisfy the underlying purpose and need for agency action. DOE currently plans to analyze in detail the project proposed by CCG and the no action alternative. DOE will also analyze design options available to CCG within the scope of the project (e.g., various methods for disposition of slag and sulfur and transportation of coal) and mitigation measures as appropriate.

Under the no action alternative, DOE would not provide the loan guarantee for the CCG project and the project would not be constructed as part of the DOE loan guarantee program. This option would not contribute to the Federal loan guarantee program goals to make loan guarantees for energy projects that “avoid, reduce, or sequester air pollutants or anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases; and employ new or significantly improved technologies.”

Preliminary Identification of Environmental Issues

The following environmental resource areas have been tentatively identified for consideration in the EIS. This list is neither intended to be all-inclusive nor a predetermined set of potential environmental impacts:

- Air quality;
- Greenhouse gas emissions and climate change;
- Energy use and production;
- Water resources, including groundwater and surface waters;
- Wetlands and floodplains;
- Geological resources;
- Ecological resources, including threatened and endangered species and species of special concern;
- Cultural resources, including historic structures and properties; sites of religious and cultural significance to tribes; and archaeological resources;
- Land use;
- Visual resources and aesthetics;
- Transportation and traffic;
- Noise and vibration;
- Hazardous materials and solid waste management;
- Human health and safety;
- Accidents and terrorism;
- Socioeconomics, including impacts to community services;
- Environmental justice.

DOE invites comments on whether other resource areas or potential issues should be considered in the EIS.

Public Scoping Process

To ensure that all issues related to DOE’s proposed action are addressed, DOE seeks public input to define the scope of the EIS. The public scoping period will begin with publication of the NOI and end on November 9, 2009. Interested government agencies, private-sector organizations, and the general public are encouraged to submit comments concerning the content of the EIS, issues and impacts to be addressed in the EIS, and alternatives that should be considered. Scoping comments should clearly describe specific issues or topics that the EIS should address to assist DOE in identifying significant issues. Comments must be postmarked or e-mailed by November 9, 2009 to ensure consideration. (See **ADDRESSES** above). Late comments will be considered to the extent practicable. DOE invites those agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise to be cooperating agencies.

A public scoping meeting will be held at a date, time, and location to be determined. Notice of this meeting will be provided in local news media and on the DOE Loan Guarantee Program’s

“NEPA Public Involvement” Web site (<http://www.lgprogram.energy.gov/NEPA-2.html>) at least 15 days prior to the date of the meeting. Members of the public and representatives of groups and Federal, State, local, and tribal agencies are invited to attend. The meeting will include both a formal opportunity to present oral comments and an informal session during which DOE and CCG personnel will be available for discussions with attendees. Displays and other forms of information about the proposed agency action, the EIS process, and the CCG proposed Facility will also be available for review. DOE requests that anyone who wishes to present oral comments at the meeting contact Ms. Colamaria by phone or e-mail (see **ADDRESSES** above). Individuals who do not make advance arrangements to speak may register at the meeting. Speakers who need more than five minutes should indicate the length of time desired in their request. DOE may need to limit speakers to five minutes initially, but will provide additional opportunities as time permits. Written comments regarding the scoping process can also be submitted to DOE officials at the scoping meeting.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 6, 2009.

Steve Isakowitz,

Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

[FR Doc. E9-24422 Filed 10-8-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-8598-2]

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 202-564-7146 or <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/>.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated July 17, 2009 (74 FR 34754).

Draft EISs

EIS No. 20090038, ERP No. D-COE-K35045-CA, PROGRAMMATIC—Los Angeles Regional Dredge Material Management Plan, Develop a Long-

Term Strategy for Managing Dredged Sediment for all Harbors within the Region, City of Long Beach and County of Los Angeles, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the need for additional alternatives analysis; analysis of sediment management options; and better evaluation of dredging methods. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20090134, ERP No. D-COE-K65363-CA, Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan (RMDP) and the Spineflower Conservation Plan (SCP), Implementation, Portion of Santa Clara River Valley, Los Angeles County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections to water quality impacts to tributaries of the Santa Clara River, and expressed concerns about impacts to air quality, traffic, and water supply. EPA recommended the maximum avoidance alternative that reduces project footprint and impacts and provided additional green building resources. Rating EO2.

EIS No. 20090177, ERP No. D-AFS-K65366-CA, Lassen National Forest, Motorized Travel Management Plan, Implementation, Butte, Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the scope of alternatives analysis, water resource impacts, decommissioning of unauthorized routes, and monitoring and enforcement of travel management requirements. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20090232, ERP No. D-BIA-K60043-CA, Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians Horseshoe Grande Fee-to-Trust Project, Construction of a Hotel and Casino Project, City of San Jacinto, Riverside County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about potential impacts to waters of the U.S. from the wastewater treatment percolation pond, and recommended mitigation measures for construction equipment emissions, pollution prevention measures to avoid soil contamination, and commitments to green building design. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20090254, ERP No. D-AFS-K65377-00, Bridgeport Travel Management Project, To Provide the Primary Framework for Sustainable Management of Motor Vehicle Use on the Bridgeport Ranger District, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Mono County, CA and Lyon, Douglas, and Mineral Counties, NV.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the scope

of alternatives analysis, water resources, wet weather and seasonal closures, erosion, decommissioning of unauthorized routes, climate change, and monitoring and enforcement of travel management requirements. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20090266, ERP No. D-IBR-K39120-CA, Madera Irrigation District Water Supply Enhancement Project, Constructing and Operating a Water Bank on the Madera Property, Madera County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the long-term feasibility of this conjunctive use/water bank project given increasingly constrained source water supplies, and potential significant impacts to vernal pools, rare alkali rain pools, and threatened and endangered species. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20090273, ERP No. D-FSA-A65177-00, PROGRAMMATIC—Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP), To Establish and Administer the Program Areas Program Component of BCAP as mandated in Title IX of the 2008 Farm Bill in the United States.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts bioenergy crops will have on water quality and air quality to waters of the U.S., and recommended a monitoring program for the BCAP and subsequent individual projects. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20090280, ERP No. DS-FHW-E40768-TN, Shelby Avenue/Demonbreun Street (Gateway Boulevard Corridor, from I-65 North [I-24 West] to I-40 West in Downtown Nashville, To Address Transportation needs in the Study Area, Davidson County, TN.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about air toxic impacts and requested that this issue be addressed. EPA also requested that the document include appropriate mitigation. Rating EC2.

Final EISs

EIS No. 20090236, ERP No. F-FHW-K53013-CA, Orange County Gateway Project, To Provide Grade Separation Alternative Along the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad tracks from west of Bradford Avenue to west of Imperial Highway (State Route 90), Cities of Placentia and Anaheim, Orange County, CA.

Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns about impacts to air quality and jurisdictional waters, as well as, cumulative impacts and environmental justice impacts.

EIS No. 20090288, ERP No. F-COE-K39041-CA, Natomas Levee Improvement Program, Phase 3 Landside Improvements Project, Issuance of Section 408 and 404 Permits, Sacramento and Sutter Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns about the residual flood risk to development in a floodplain protected by levees, and indirect and cumulative environmental effects. EPA recommended Natomas Basin flood safety plan implementation prior to additional development.

EIS No. 20090300, ERP No. F-NPS-K61169-AZ, Fire Management Plan, Management of Wildland and Prescribed Fire, Protection of Human Life and Property Restoration and Maintenance of Fire Dependent Ecosystems, and Reduction of Hazardous Fuels, Grand Canyon National Park, Coconino County, AZ.

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

Dated: October 6, 2009.

Robert W. Hargrove,
Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

[FR Doc. E9-24468 Filed 10-8-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-8598-1]

Environmental Impacts Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564-1399 or <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/>.

Weekly Receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed 09/28/2009 through 10/02/2009 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9

EIS No. 20090340, Final EIS, AFS, UT, Pockets Resource Management Project, Additional Information on Analysis and Disclosure on the Effect of the PA and Alternatives on Three Unroaded and Undeveloped Areas Identified on a 2005 Draft Map, Proposes to Salvage Dead and Dying Spruce/Fir, Regenerate Aspen, and Manage Travel, Escalante Ranger District, Dixie National Forest, Garfield County, UT, Wait Period Ends: 11/09/2009, Contact: Marianne Breeze Orton 435-676-9360.

EIS No. 20090341, Final EIS, IBR, CA, Grassland Bypass Project 2010-2019 Project, Proposed new Use