required for true natural system restoration. EPA encouraged the COE to include additional water quality features in the pending FPEIS and future optimization of water quality features. EPA expressed concerns regarding project uncertainties associated with the proposed aquifer recovery system funding and modeling.

ERP No. D–COE–K39055–AZ, Rating LO, Alamo Lake Reoperation and Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study, Implementation, Reoperation of Alma Dam on the Bill Williams River, La Paz and Mohave Counties, AZ.

SUMMARY: EPA had no objections to the project which would result in increased seasonal flows from Alamo Lake that should have positive effects on riparian habitat downstream.

ERP No. D–IBR–K39054–CA Rating EC2, Groundwater Replenishment System, Implementation to Repurifying Water from Orange County Water District (OCWD) Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD), Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, Orange County, CA.

SUMMARY: EPA supported the project which focuses on wastewater reuse and recycling, and supported the project benefit of postponing the need for an additional ocean outfall discharge pipe. EPA urged the project sponsors to continue to aggressively pursue other demand management measures. EPA expressed concerns and requested additional information regarding: (1) potential adverse effects on flood protection, (2) operation and effectiveness of the saltwater intrusion barrier, and (3) implementation and effectiveness monitoring.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–COE–C39010–NJ, Lower Cape May Meadows—Cape May Point Feasibility Study, Ecosystem Restoration, New Jersey Shore Protection Study, Cape May County, NJ.

SUMMARY: EPA expressed environmental concerns that implementation of multiple projects of the type (and other projects effecting the same resources) could result in adverse cumulative impacts. EPA suggested that a comprehensive cumulative impacts analysis be prepared for all of these projects prior to construction.

ERP No. F–COE–F35042–IN, Indiana Harbor and Canal Dredging and Confined Disposal Facility, Construction and Operation, Comprehensive Management Plan, East Chicago, Lake County, ID.

SUMMARY: The Final EIS has adequately resolved EPA's previous concerns. Therefore, EPA has no objections to the implementation of the proposed project.

ERP No. F–TVA–E39037–00, Shoreline Management Initiative: An Assessment of Residential Shoreline Development Impacts in the Tennessee Valley, Mainstream Tennessee River and Tributary Reservoirs in AL, KY, NC, TN, GA, MS and VA.

SUMMARY: EPA continues to have some environmental concerns due to the inherent nature of shoreline development relative to erosion, water quality, habitat loss, and induced (secondary) impacts associated with development.

ERP No. FS–COE–C32030–00, Arthur Kill Channel—Howland Hook Marine Terminal, Deepening and Realignment, Limited Reevaluation Report (LRR) Port of New York and New Jersey, NY and NJ.

SUMMARY: EPA does not anticipate that the proposed project would result in significant adverse environmental impacts and does not object to its implementation.

Dated: March 16, 1999.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 99–6804 Filed 3–18–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPP–00453; FRL–6070–4]

Notice of Availability of Regional Environmental Stewardship Program Grants

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: EPA is announcing the availability of approximately $498 thousand in fiscal year 1999 grant/cooperative agreement funds under section 20 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as amended, (the Act), for grants to States and all federally recognized Native American Tribes. The grant dollars are targeted at State and Tribal programs that address reduction of the risks associated with pesticide use in agricultural and non-agricultural settings in the United States. EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs is offering the following grant opportunities to interested and qualified parties.

DATES: In order to be considered for funding during the FY 99 award cycle, all applications must be received by the appropriate EPA regional office on or before May 3, 1999. EPA will make its award decisions by June 2, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Your EPA Regional Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program Coordinator. Contact names for the coordinators are listed under Unit IV. of this document.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Availability of FY'99 Funds

With this publication, EPA is announcing the availability of approximately $498 thousand in grant/cooperative agreement funds for FY'99. The Agency has delegated grant making authority to the EPA Regional Offices. Regional offices are responsible for the solicitation of interest, the screening of proposals, and the selection of projects. Grant guidance will be provided to all applicants along with any supplementary information the Regions may wish to provide. All applicants must address the criteria listed under Unit III.B. of this document. In addition, applicants may be required to meet any supplemental Regional criteria. Interested applicants should contact their Regional PESP coordinator listed under Unit IV. of this document for more information.

II. Eligible Applicants

In accordance with the Act ". . . Federal agencies, universities, or others as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act, . . ." are eligible to receive a grant; however, because of restrictions associated with the funds appropriated for this program, the eligible applicants are limited. Eligible applicants for purposes of funding under this grant program include the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, any agency or instrumentality of a State including State universities, and all federally recognized Native American Tribes. For convenience, the term "State" in this notice refers to all eligible applicants. Local governments, private universities, private nonprofit entities, private businesses, and individuals are not eligible. The organizations excluded from applying directly are encouraged to work with eligible applicants in developing proposals that include them as participants in the projects. Contact your EPA Regional PESP coordinator for assistance in identifying and contacting eligible applicants. EPA strongly encourages this type of cooperative arrangement.

III. Activities and Criteria

A. General

The goal of PESP is to reduce the risks associated with pesticide use in agricultural and non-agricultural settings in the United States. The purpose of the grant program is to support the establishment and expansion of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) as a tool to be used to accomplish the goals of PESP. The grant program is also designed to research alternative pest management practices, research and publish/demonstrate unique application techniques, research control methods for pest complexes, research and produce educational materials for better pest identification or management, and other activities that further the goals of PESP. EPA specifically seeks to build State and local IPM capacities or to evaluate the economic feasibility of new IPM approaches at the State level (i.e., innovative approaches and methodologies that use application or other strategies to reduce the risks associated with pesticide use). Funds awarded under the grant program should be used to support the Environmental Stewardship Program and its goal of reducing the risk/use of pesticides. State projects might focus on, for example:

- Researching the effectiveness of multimedia communication activities for, including but not limited to: promoting local IPM activities, providing technical assistance to pesticide users; collecting and analyzing data to target outreach and technical assistance opportunities; developing measures to determine and document progress in pollution prevention; and identifying regulatory and non-regulatory barriers or incentives to pollution prevention.
- Researching methods for establishing IPM as an environmental management priority, establishing prevention goals, developing strategies to meet those goals, and integrating the ethic within both governmental and non-governmental institutions of the State or region.
- Initiating research or other projects that test and support: innovative techniques for reducing pesticide risk or using pesticides in a way to reduce risk, innovative application techniques to reduce worker and environmental exposure, various approaches and methodologies to measure progress towards meeting the goal of 75% implementation of IPM by the year 2000.

A list of projects funded in FY'98 may be obtained from the internet at URL http://www.epa.gov/oppbppd1/PESP/grants.htm or from the Regional PESP coordinator listed under Unit IV. of this document.

B. Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

1. Qualifications and experience of the applicant relative to the proposed project.

- Does the applicant demonstrate experience in the field of the proposed activity?
- Does the applicant have the properly trained staff, facilities, or infrastructure in place to conduct the project?

2. Consistency of applicant's proposed project with the risk reduction goals of the PESP.

3. Provision for a quantitative or qualitative evaluation of the project's success at achieving the stated goals.

- Is the project designed in such a way that it is possible to measure and document the results quantitatively and qualitatively?
- Does the applicant identify the method that will be used to measure and document the project's results quantitatively and qualitatively?
- Will the project assess or suggest a means for measuring progress in reducing risk/use of pesticides in the United States?

4. Likelihood the project can be replicated to benefit other communities or the product may have broad utility to a widespread audience. Can this project, taking into account typical staff and financial restraints, be replicated by similar organizations in different locations to address the same or similar problem?

C. Program Management

Awards of FY'99 funds will be managed through the EPA Regional Offices.

D. Contacts

A generic request for proposal will be available on EPA's PESP web site on or before March 19, 1999 at http://www.epa.gov/oppbppd1/PESP/grants.htm. Interested applicants must also contact the appropriate EPA Regional PESP coordinator listed under Unit IV. of this document to obtain specific instructions, regional criteria, and guidance for submitting proposals.

IV. Regional Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program Contacts

Region I: (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont), Robert Koethe, (CPT), 1 Congress St., Boston, MA 02203, Telephone: (617) 918–1535, koethe.robert@epamail.epa.gov

Region II: (New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands), Audrey Moore, (MS-500), 2890 Woodbridge Ave., Edison, NJ 08837, Telephone: (732) 906–6809, moore.audrey@epamail.epa.gov

Region III: (Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, District of Columbia), Lisa Donahue, (3WC32), 1650 Arch St., Philadelphia, PA 19103, Telephone: (215) 814–2062, donahue.lisa@epamail.epa.gov

Region IV: (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee), Lora Lee Schroeder, 12th Floor, Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth St., SW., Atlanta, GA 30303–3104, Telephone: (404) 562–9015, schroeder.lora@epamail.epa.gov

Region V: (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin), David Macarus, (DT-8J), 77 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604, Telephone: (312) 353–5814, macarus.david@epamail.epa.gov

Region VI: (Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas), Jerry Collins, (6PD-P), 1445 Ross Ave., 6th Floor, Suite 600, Dallas, TX 75202, Telephone: (214) 665–7562, collins.jerry@epamail.epa.gov

Region VII: (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska), Jamie Green, 726 Minnesota Ave., Kansas City, KS 66101, Telephone: (913) 551–5332, green.jamie@epamail.epa.gov

Region VIII: (Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming), Cindy Schaffer, (8P2-TX), 999 18th St., Suite 500, Denver, CO 80202–2466, Telephone: (303) 312–6417, schaffer.cindy@epamail.epa.gov

Region IX: (Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, American Samoa, Guam), Roccena Lawatch, (CMD4-3), 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105, Telephone: (415) 744–1068, lawatch.roccena@epamail.epa.gov

Region X: (Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington), Karl Arne, (ECO-084), 1200 Sixth Ave., Seattle, WA 98101, Telephone: (206) 553–2576, rne.karl@epamail.epa.gov

List of Subjects

Environmental protection.

Dated: March 12, 1999.

Janet L. Andersen,

Director, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 99–6785 Filed 3–18–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F