DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Final Environmental Assessment for BRAC 95 Disposal and Reuse of Fort Missoula, MT

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Pub. L. 101–510 (as amended), the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended the closure of Fort Missoula, Montana.

The Final Environmental Assessment (EA) evaluates the environmental impacts of the disposal and subsequent reuse of the 52 acres. Alternatives examined in the EA include encumbered disposal of the property, unencumbered disposal of the property, and no action. Encumbered disposal refers to transfer or conveyance of property having restrictions on subsequent use as a result of any Army-imposed or legal restraint. Under the no action alternative, the Army would not dispose of property but would maintain it in caretaker status for an indefinite period.

While disposal of Fort Missoula is the Army's primary action, the EA also analyzes the potential environmental effects of reuse as a secondary action by means of evaluating intensity-based reuse scenarios. The Army's preferred alternative for disposal of Fort Missoula property is encumbered disposal, with encumbrances pertaining to the possible presence of lead-based paint and asbestos-containing material, and the requirement for a right of reentry for environmental clean-up.

A Notice of Intent (NOI) declaring the Army's intent to prepare an EA for the disposal and reuse of Fort Missoula was published in the **Federal Register** on September 22, 1995 (60 FR 49264).

DATES: Comments must be submitted on August 7, 1998. Comments received on this EA will be considered by the Army prior to initiating action.

COPIES: The Final EA is available for review at the Fort Missoula Public Library. A copy of the Final EA may be obtained by writing to Mr. Ken Brunner, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District (ATTN: CENWS–ED–TB–ER), 4735 East Marginal Way South, Seattle, Washington 98124–2255, or by facsimile at (206) 764–4470.

Dated: July 1, 1998.

Raymond J. Fatz,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health), OASA (I,L&E).

[FR Doc. 98–18014 Filed 7–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–10–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Notification of the U.S. Army Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Citizen Guide for Accessing Army Information

AGENCY: U.S. Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Army Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts Office has prepared a Citizens Guide for public use in obtaining information from the Army. The Guide is a short, simple explanation of what the Freedom of Information Act is designed to do, and how a member of the public can use the document to access Army information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions regarding the Freedom of Information Act Citizens Guide should be addressed to Rose Marie Christensen, phone (703) 806–5698, Chief, Department of the Army Freedom of Information/Privacy Acts Office, 7798 Cissna Road, Suite 205, Springfield, VA 22150–3166.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Citizens Guide provides addresses and telephone numbers of each functional area within the Army. Electronic access of the guide can be obtained through the Internet using the following address: http://www.rmd.belvoir.army.mil/clickher.htm Additionally, limited paper copies of the document are also available. They can be obtained by contacting the Army Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts Office at the above address or telephone number.

Eric E. Tolbert,

Chief, Records Management Program Services.

[FR Doc. 98–18029 Filed 7–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Proposed Implementation of the Defense Table of Official Distances (DTOD) for Passenger Transportation and Travel Services

AGENCY: Military Traffic Management Command, DoD.

ACTION: Notice (Request for Comments).

SUMMARY: The Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC), as the Program Director for the Department of Defense (DoD), intends to utilize a new automated distance calculation product known as the Defense Table of Distances (DTOD) as part of the Groups Operational Passenger System (GOPAX). The DTOD will replace existing distance calculation products used within the DoD, such as DoD Official Table of Distances. The DTOD will become the DoD standard source for distance information worldwide. Commercially, DTOD is known as PC*MILER by ALK Associates, Inc. Carriers may continue to use other mileage sources for preparation of Offers of Service, and for their own business purposes. However, the DTOD/PC*MILER will be the DoD Standard for all distance calculations, analysis or audits for transportation services billed on a per mile (mileage) basis. Carriers and passenger service providers participating in the DoD passenger transportation and travel services programs must agree to be bound by the DTOD/PC*MILER distance calculations for payment and audit purposes.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before September 8, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to: Headquarters, Military Traffic Management Command, ATTN: MTOP–T, Room 617, 5611 Columbia Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041–5050.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Additional information concerning the DTOD for MTMC Passenger Transportation and Travel Services Programs can be provided by contacting Ms. Beverly Cox at (703) 681–9444. Information regarding DTOD compliant commercial software and other technical information can be provided by contacting ALK Associates, Inc. at 1 (800) 377–MILE or on the Internet at www.pcmiler.com.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. The proposed effective date for use of the DTOD in DoD Passenger Transportation and Travel Services programs is 1 June 1999.

2. Existing Groups Operational Passenger System (GOPAX) mileage tables will be replaced by DTOD/PC*MILER software.

3. ALK Associates, Inc., will provide all interested parties the capability to license PC*MILER, to ensure the ability to consistently determine the exact mileage that the DOD uses for entitlement determination and audit purposes.

4. It is anticipated that transition to DTOD will have no significant impact upon passenger carriers since rates are not obtained or paid on a mileage basis, but rather on a per seat or per trip basis. While per seat cost and trip costs must consider distance, offerors will be free to establish their costs based on the distance calculation methods of their choice.

5. The DTOD/PC*MILER products will calculate both ''shortest'' and ''practical'' mileage. It will contain Standford Point Location Codes, military locations and other worldwide locations required by DoD. Updates and version control DTOD and PC*MILER will be consistent with industry practices. Carriers and/or other parties who choose to use PC*MILER will have opportunities to provide feedback to ALK Associates, Inc., the provider of DTOD software, regarding routings, database suggestions such as distance differences, road preference suggestions, road re-classifications, new locations, etc.

6. Interested parties are invited to provide comments concerning the use of the DTOD to the address provided above. Comments will be accepted for a period of 60 days from the publication date of this notice.

7. Regulatory Flexibility Act. This change is related to public contracts and is designed to standardize distance calculation for line-haul transportation. This change is not considered rule making within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–612.

8. Paperwork Reduction Act. The Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3051 *et seq.*, does not apply because no information collection requirement or recordskeeping responsibilities are imposed on offerors, contractors, or members of the public.

Francis A. Galluzzo,

ADCSOPS Transportation Services.

[FR Doc. 98–18021 Filed 7–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Termination of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Red River Chloride Control Project (RRCCP), Texas and Oklahoma

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the termination of work toward preparation of an EIS for the RRCCP. A Draft Supplement to the Final EIS for the project was filed with the Environmental Protection Agency and published in the **Federal Register** on May 5, 1995 (EIS No. 950177). The final Supplement was scheduled for release on January 8, 1996, but was delayed until May 13, 1996, and again until August 1996 so that additional information received during the review process could be considered and incorporated into the document.

As a result of public review comments, opposition from natural resource agencies, and Washington level review, it has been determined that the final Supplement will *not* be released and filed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions or comments concerning the proposed action should be addressed to Mr. David L. Combs, Chief, Environmental Analysis and Compliance Branch, Tulsa District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, P.O. Box 61, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74121, telephone 918–669–7188.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: During the National Environmental Policy Act process for the Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (SFEIS), several issues were identified as concerns by the public and commenting natural resource agencies. The major concerns were categorized into the following components: (1) hydrological, biological, and water quality issues concerning fish, aquatic invertebrates, algae/biofilm, aquatic macrophytes, wetland/riparian ecosystem components, along with continued function and integrity of the upper Red River ecosystem; (2) the Lake Texoma component, including chloride/turbidity relationships, chloride/fish reproduction issues, chloride/plankton community issues, chloride/nutrient dynamics issues, and impacts on lake sport fisheries, aesthetics, and recreational values; (3) a selenium component addressing selenium concentrations and impacts on biota; (4) changes in land use at the Area VI brine storage reservoir; (5) impacts on the potential to designate the upper Red River as a wild and scenic river; (6) man-made brines and associated reduction; (7) Section 401 water quality issues; (8) mitigation as it relates to indirect habitat losses resulting from irrigated cropland and direct impacts from construction of project components; (9) impacts on the commercial bait minnow fishery of the upper Red River; (10) Federally-listed threatened and endangered species; and (11) unquantifiable/undefined impacts.

In an attempt to resolve environmental concerns, the District participated in an Environmental Issue Resolution Process (EIRP) along with the project sponsor and the natural resource agencies. A steering committee was developed to oversee technical workgroups formed to address the major areas of concern which were identified as selenium accumulation, Lake Texoma productivity, and the upper Red River ecosystem. The ultimate goal was to develop an Environmental Operational Plan (EOP) acceptable to all agencies for inclusion into the SFEIS. The overall objective of the EOP was to protect against unacceptable environmental changes with the project.

Despite the efforts of all the agencies through the EIRP, areas of controversy regarding the potential for and/or the relative significance of impacts of the project remain for nearly every issue addressed during the process. Controversy remains regarding: (1) the amount of chloride loads being contributed by man-made sources; (2) the levels of significance of impacts to biota, specifically fishes, of the upper Red River due to reduction of chlorides and flow; (3) the use of surface storage impoundments and the potential for selenium accumulation; (4) the significance of chloride impact on lake turbidity in Lake Texoma and potential impacts on the lake fishery, and (5) the amount of mitigation lands required to mitigate project impacts.

Natural resource agency concerns for potential impacts associated with the RRCCP are warranted. However, the degree and severity of impacts are speculative and difficult to ascertain as many potential impacts are indirect and may or may not occur over the life of the project. Also, many of the impacts to the upper Red River ecosystem and Lake Texoma are difficult to address because of the complexity of these issues. Furthermore, many impacts may not be quantifiable prior to completion of extensive baseline data collection and long-term project monitoring. Adding to this difficulty is the fact that few long-term trend analyses have been conducted within the upper Red River Basin.

During the EIRP process, the District funded additional studies to more adequately address natural resource agency concerns and the severity of impacts. However, most study findings were unable to definitively quantify the magnitude of impacts, if any, attributable to the project. Consequently, there are still several unresolved issues that may only be resolved following long-term collection