DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Public Meetings for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Bluestone Dam Safety Assurance Project, Hinton, WV

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: With the distribution of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) having been completed on the Bluestone Lake Dam Safety Assurance Project, this notice announces the following two Public Meetings to consider comments concerning the document:

First Meeting

Date of Meeting: April 1, 1998.
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Place: State Capitol Complex, Building 7, Conference Room C, 1900 Kanawha Blvd., Charleston, West Virginia.

Second Meeting

Date of Meeting: April 2, 1998.
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Place: Summers County High School, Auditorium, 1 Bobcat Drive, Hinton, West Virginia.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Please address questions regarding this notice to Mr. A. Benjamin Borda, Environmental Analysis Branch, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 502 8th Street, Huntington, WV 25701. By telephone call (304) 529–5712 or by facsimile (304) 529–5136.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the policy of evaluating existing Corps of Engineers projects to ensure dam safety, the Huntington District is evaluating alternative measures to modify Bluestone Dam consistent with present day design criteria. The study is being conducted through the Corps of Engineers (COE) Dam Safety Assurance Program for the evaluation of existing dams. The COE has determined that improvements to the dam are necessary to accommodate the probable maximum flood (PMF). The DEIS analyzes three structural alternatives for the correction of hydrologic and seismic deficiencies at Bluestone Dam as well as a no-action alternative. These alternatives are summarized as follows:

a. *Alternative 1.* Raise the existing dam and strengthen it, without adding additional discharge capacity. It will sustain a pool elevation of 1555.8 feet and safely withstand the PMF.

b. *Alternative 2.* Maintain the current height of the dam and strengthen it to sustain a pool elevation of 1534.5 feet and construct an auxiliary spillway for additional discharge capacity, to safely withstand the PMF.

c. *Alternative 3.* Raise the existing dam and strengthen it, while utilizing the six existing penstocks to allow additional discharge capacity. It will sustain a pool elevation of 1546.8 feet and safely withstand the PMF. This is the preferred alternative.

d. *No Action Alternative.* Make no changes to the dam, either physically or operationally. The dam would not withstand the PMF. It is highly probable that the dam would fail at a pool elevation estimated to be 1532 feet.

Alternative 3 was not identified during scoping but arose from environmental and economic considerations undertaken during the development of the DEIS. The features of Alternative 3 are intermediate to the original structural alternatives (1 & 2). The DEIS contains specifics on all three structural alternatives in addition to a description of projected impacts.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the COE to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from this Federal action. NEPA also requires that the COE discover and address concerns the public may have about the proposed project. This was accomplished initially through the ''scoping'' process. With distribution of the DEIS having been completed, the COE is now making the above notice of meetings to consider comments concerning the document.

Interested groups and individuals are encouraged to attend the meetings and to present oral comments on the environmental issues which they believe should be considered further in the Final EIS. Anyone who would like to make an oral presentation should telephone or write to Mr. Ben Borda (above address) by 4 p.m., March 25, 1998, so that time may be allotted during the meetings, and a name placed on the speaker list.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–6204 Filed 3–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–GM–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Intent To Prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Plot and Green Ridge Local Flood Protection Projects Within the City of Scranton, Lackawanna County, PA

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, is initiating a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Plot and Green Ridge Flood Protection Projects. The SEIS will be prepared to (1) Supplement the previously completed Final Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Scranton, Pennsylvania, Flood Protection Feasibility Study in January 1992; (2) to identify potential environmental impacts associated with the various project alternatives; and (3) to document compliance with NEPA requirements. Specifically, the SEIS will identify existing conditions, identify any changed environmental conditions, re-examine previously collected data in light of new or updated methodologies, collect new environmental data, and evaluate the feasibility of both new and previously considered potential project actions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions about the proposed action and SEIS can be addressed to Ms. Maria De La Torre, Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, ATTN:.CENAB–PL–P, P.O. Box 1715, Baltimore, Maryland 21203–1715, telephone (410) 962–2911 or 1–800–295–1610, E-mail address: maria.e.delatorre@usace.army.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. A study of the Lackawanna River was originally authorized October 1, 1986, by resolution of the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works and Transportation (House Document 702). An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared by the Corps of Engineers and was completed in January 1992. This EIS evaluated the feasibility of proposed alternative solutions for providing flood protection along the Lackawanna River in Scranton, Pennsylvania. At that time, the 1992 EIS recommended structural flood protection for only the right bank,