

operation of production vehicles and their eventual demilitarization. Potential environmental impacts of these life-cycle stages may include Air Quality, Noise, Water, Soil and Groundwater, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes, and Flora, Fauna and Threatened or Endangered Species at each of these life-cycle phases.

### c. Additional Findings

Impacts from the proposed action would be minimal and not significant for the following reasons:

(1) The ASV will be used in its intended environment. This intended environment includes vehicle production and some testing at the Contractor's facility, and the remainder of life-cycle activities at Army installations and facilities.

(2) The ASV is very similar to vehicles produced commercially and vehicles already in the Army inventory. It is being produced in low to moderate quantities and will not significantly increase the vehicle population at Army installations and facilities.

(3) The overall environmental risk associated with the ASV is very low. It does not introduce any new technologies or processes. Vehicle life cycle activities do not introduce any potential environmental impacts that are not already currently mitigated by Army policy and procedures.

(4) The ASV Project Manager has ensured that the Contractor producing the vehicle is environmentally compliant, has no permit violations, and has commercial practices for Hazardous Material Management and Pollution Prevention in production of the ASV.

(5) The ASV Product Manager recognizes that Army installations and facilities have environmental plans and measures in place to address vehicle life cycle activities very similar to that of the ASV to prevent, mitigate and remediate environmental damage caused by vehicle operation. Vehicle operations at these Army installations and facilities are in conjunction with normal activities that are already addressed in their site specific environmental impact statements.

### d. Determination

It is therefore concluded that this program:

(1) Is not a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of human environment.

(2) Will not have a significant impact on the environment.

(3) Is not likely to be environmentally controversial.

(4) Will not likely result in litigation based on environmental quality issues.

(5) Does not require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

**Phillip O. Meengs,**

*Project Manager, Light Tactical Vehicles.*

[FR Doc. 97-31036 Filed 11-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

#### Corps of Engineers

#### **Atlantic Coast of Long Island, From Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York (Reach 1—Fire Island Inlet to Moriches Inlet Interim Plan for Storm Damage Protection)**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The New York District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is beginning preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for proposed measures for interim storm damage protection for Reach 1—Fire Island Inlet to Moriches Inlet (study area) of the Atlantic Coast of Long Island, from Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York. A Notice of Intent for the preparation of a DEIS for the Atlantic Coast of Long Island, from Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York Reformulation Study, a long-term solution for the entire 83 mile study area, has also been published in the **Federal Register** dated July 28, 1997 (Volume 62, Number 144). For this Notice of Intent, the Corps is considering interim protection measures to address critical areas due to recent storm activity which has resulted in continual erosion leading to a decrease in the width of beach and a loss of beach material. Due to the continued erosion and a lack of sufficiently high beaches, berms or dune systems, residential and commercial developments have become increasingly susceptible to storm damage from flooding and wave attack and may need to be addressed prior to completion of the Reformulation Study. The EIS will be prepared according to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers procedures for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4332(2) (C), and consistent with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' policy to facilitate public understanding and scrutiny of agency proposals. This notice of intent is published as required by the President's Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing the

provisions of NEPA, 40 CFR Parts 1500–1508.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Stephen A. Couch, Study Manager, (212) 264-9077; Mr. Peter M. Weppler, EIS Coordinator, (212) 264-4663; Planning Division, Corps of Engineers, New York District, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, New York 10278-0090.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The overall Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York, Combined Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1960 in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 425, 86th Congress dated June 21, 1960. The original authorized project provided for beach erosion control and hurricane protection along five reaches by means of widening the beaches along the developed areas, raising the dunes by artificial placement of suitable sand, grass planting on the dunes, and construction of interior drainage structures at Mecox Bay, Sagaponack Lake, and Georgica Pond. The project authorized construction of 50 groins subject to determination of their actual need. The authorization was subsequently modified by Section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of October 12, 1962, Section 31 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974, Section 502 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, and Section 102 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. These modifications were made primarily to adjust the cost sharing provisions of the authorized project.

### 1. Location of Proposed Action

The project area is located entirely in Suffolk County, Long Island, New York, along the Atlantic and bay shore of the towns of Babylon, Islip, and Brookhaven. The study area is approximately 30 miles long. The study area includes Great South Bay which is connected to the Atlantic Ocean through Fire Island Inlet, a federal navigation channel. Great South Bay is connected to Moriches Bay by a narrow channel behind the barrier island. The westernmost portion of the study area, Fire Island Inlet, is located approximately 52 miles by water east of the Battery, New York. The project area includes the Atlantic Ocean and Great South Bay, Fire Island proper, Moriches Inlet, barrier beaches, the mainland of Long Island fronted by Fire Island Proper, as well as suitable offshore borrow areas that will supply material for beach construction and replenishment.

## 2. Description of Proposed Action

The basic design of the interim plan consists of beachfill with a minimum berm width of 90 feet (ft) at elevation +9.5 ft NGVD, and a minimum 25 ft wide dune at elevation +15 ft NGVD. Proposed dune slopes are 1V:5H to Mean Low Water (MLW), and 1V:30H below MLW.

Variations of this basic design plan occur between Kismet and Point O'Woods and at Old Inlet in the Federal Wilderness Area. The dune and berm elevations from Kismet to Point O'Woods were increased to 18 ft NGVD and 11.5 ft NGVD, respectively to provide a 44 year level of protection. This modification is necessitated by the low elevations north of the dune in these areas.

Due to the environmental sensitivity of the Wilderness Area, and concerns raised by the Department of the Interior, fill in Old Inlet has been deferred. The District instead recommends use of a feeder beach and stockpile at Smith Point County Park. The deferred construction could be analyzed and implemented in the future, to minimize the negative environmental impacts associated with repeated breach closure efforts.

## 3. Reasonable Alternative Actions

In addition to the "No Action" alternative, the interim storm damage protection study will consider variations of the beach fill alternative to identify a short term solution to the severe erosion that has occurred within the study area and which continues to threaten the mainland communities with increased exposure to storm damages.

## 4. Scoping Process

### a. Public Involvement

Additional scoping correspondence detailing the proposed plan will be distributed to all interested public and private agencies and organizations with the intent of receiving opinions all from interested parties.

### b. Scoping Meetings

The scoping meetings are intended to assist in defining the focus of the EIS issues. A public notice issued at a later date will provide the dates, times and places of the scoping meetings. Further, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will provide ample opportunity for public participation in defining the issues to be addressed in the EIS and in reviewing and commenting on the draft EIS. Additions to this mailing list can be made by notifying the project EIS coordinator.

### c. Significant Issues Requiring In-Depth Analysis

1. Water Quality Impacts; 2. Archaeological and Cultural Resources Impacts; 3. Aquatic and Terrestrial Resources Impacts; 4. Impacts to Shorebird Populations; 5. Recreational Impacts; 6. Economic Impacts; 7. Impacts to Longshore Sand Transport.

### d. Environmental Review and Consultation

Review will be conducted as outlined in the Council on Environmental Quality regulations dated November 29, 1983 (40 CFR parts 1500-1508) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineer regulation ER 200-2-2 dated March 4, 1988.

### e. Federal Agency Participation in the EIS Process

Federal agencies with an interest in this EIS effort are requested to participate as cooperating agencies pursuant to 40 CFR Part 1501.6. All interested federal agencies are requested to submit a letter of intent to Colonel Gary Thomas, District Engineer at the above address.

## 5. Estimated Date of DEIS Availability

June 1998.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-31039 Filed 11-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-06-M

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Corps of Engineers; Department of the Army

#### Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Stabilization of the Bluff Toe at Norco Bluffs

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

ACTION: Correction.

SUMMARY: In previous **Federal Register** notice (Vol 62, No. 105, page 29719) Monday, June 2, 1997, make the following corrections:

On Page 29719 in column two, Summary paragraph, lines six through eleven, the sentence should be changed to read "The purpose of the proposed project is to stabilize the toe of the bluff parallel to Shadow Canyon Circle, Alahambra Street, and River Ridge Drive, as far upstream as Crest Drive, in the City of Norco, and thereby maintain the location of the 566 foot elevation line."

On Page 29719 in column three, Availability of the Draft EIS paragraph,

change the date from "September 1997" to "March 1998."

The above corrections are required to clarify the location of the proposed project which has been expanded to cover areas immediately upstream and downstream of the originally proposed project, and to inform individuals of the change in the availability of the draft EIS for publication and circulation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Any comments on this increase in project area should be sent to Mr. Alex Watt, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles district, Programs and Project Management Division at (213) 452-3860.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** None.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-31037 Filed 11-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-KF-M

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

### Corps of Engineers

#### Availability of a Proposed Plan for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)

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

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: During the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, the Ashland 1 (including Seaway Area D) and Ashland 2 Sites became contaminated as a result of disposal and relocation of residues from uranium processing, performed in support of the nation's early atomic energy program, at the Linde Site. The sites are being addressed under the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP). In December 1989, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) published a Notice of Intent to complete a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study-Environmental Impact Statement (RI/FS-EIS) for the Tonawanda (Ashland 1, 2, Seaway D, and Linde) Site. Since the issuance of that notice, DOE established a policy in June 1994 of incorporating National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) values into Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) documentation. In accordance with that policy, likewise, the Corps does not intend to issue a separate Environmental Impact Statement for the Tonawanda Site. The Proposed Plan summarizes the findings of the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility