RECLAMATION
Managing Water in the West

Summary of Public Comments

Northwest Area Water Supply Project

Prepared by Cardno ENTRIX for the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation

August 12, 2011

Contents

Page

Introduction **1**
Purpose and Need for Federal Action **1**
Background **2**
Scoping Process **3**
Scoping Summary **4**
Project Purpose and Need 4
Alternatives 4
Cumulative Impacts 4
Missouri River and Depletions 5
Invasive Species Transfer 5
Transboundary Effects 6
Climate Change 6
Mitigation Monitoring 6
Construction Impacts 6
Future Public Involvement **7**

Appendix A Northwest Area Water Supply Project Supplemental EIS Notice of Intent, August 12, 2010

Introduction

This Summary of Public Scoping compiles the public and agency comments received during the formal scoping process for the Northwest Area Water Supply Project (Project) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Following brief background information on the Project and on the scoping process, this report presents a summary of the scoping comments gathered by the Bureau of Reclamation for consideration in preparing the Supplemental EIS.

Pursuant to Section 102 (2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, Reclamation is preparing this Supplemental EIS and acting under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, as the lead federal agency. Reclamation has elected to establish a cooperating agency team to assist in preparing the supplemental EIS. Cooperating agencies include the City of Minot, Garrison Diversion Conservancy District, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, , and the North Dakota State Water Commission which will coordinate efforts for the State agencies and will involve the Department of Health and the Game and Fish Department as appropriate. The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe and the Three Affiliated Tribes were also invited to participate; however, Reclamation has not received a response to this request to date. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service respectfully declined the invitation but they will continue to be actively involved with the Project as a reviewing agency. These agencies were invited to be cooperating agencies because of their expertise or jurisdiction.

Purpose and Need for Federal Action

The following Statement of Purpose and Need was included in the original Notice of Intent to Prepare a Supplemental EIS published in the *Federal Register* on August 12, 2010 (Appendix A):

- The purpose of the proposed action is to provide a reliable source of high quality treated water to northwestern North Dakota for Municipal, Rural and Industrial (MR&I) uses.

The Project is needed:

(1) to provide high quality treated water because northwestern North Dakota has experienced water supply problems for many years,
(2) to replace poor quality groundwater sources presently used for MR&I purposes, and
(3) because the surface water supplies within the service area are insufficient from both a quality and quantity standpoint.

This Supplemental EIS is needed to comply with the Court order of March 5, 2010, and fully satisfy NEPA. Reclamation is conducting additional analyses to address the Court's order regarding the consequences of transferring potentially invasive species into the Hudson Bay Basin and the cumulative impacts of water withdrawals on Lake Sakakawea and the Missouri River. In addition, Reclamation is re-examining and updating prior NEPA analyses that have been completed in connection with the Project to date.

Background

The Project is designed as a bulk water distribution system that would serve local communities and rural water systems in 10 counties in northwestern North Dakota, including the community of Minot. The Project would convey water from Lake Sakakawea, in the Missouri River Basin, through a buried pipeline to Minot, surrounding communities and rural water systems. Most of the communities and rural water systems to be served by the Project are located in the Hudson Bay Basin. The planning, design and construction of the Project is a cooperative effort between Reclamation and the state of North Dakota. Reclamation provides technical and financial assistance to the state of North Dakota for the planning and development of municipal, rural and industrial projects throughout the state. As the lead federal agency, Reclamation is responsible for ensuring compliance with NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act and other federal laws.

During Project planning, environmental issues associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project were evaluated as required by the NEPA. A final Environmental Assessment, completed in 2001, evaluated options to meet the need of the Project, described the potential impacts and identified environmental commitments to avoid, minimize or mitigate for the potential impacts of the Project. Interbasin transfer of water was a key issue evaluated in the planning and development of the Project. Based on this environmental assessment, Reclamation decided to proceed with the proposed project and approved a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in September 2001.

Project construction began in the spring of 2002 on a portion of main transmission pipeline between Lake Sakakawea and Minot. In October 2002, the Province of Manitoba Canada filed a lawsuit against the Department of the Interior in U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C. The Province challenged the adequacy of the environmental assessment and FONSI and requested an injunction prohibiting the authorization or expenditure of federal funds on the Project.

In 2005, the District Court ordered Reclamation to revisit the FONSI upon completion of further environmental analysis. The order stated that additional analyses should consider potential impacts associated with not fully treating the Missouri River water at its source, and potential impacts that could occur due to pipeline leaks and possible failure of water treatment systems. The court also partially denied the request for an injunction, allowing Project construction to continue, with some restrictions. In response to the court order,

Reclamation initiated additional environmental analysis in the form of an EIS in 2006. Reclamation worked with other federal, tribal, state and local government agencies to assist with the preparation of the EIS, as well as gathering input from the public. The EIS evaluated a wide range of water treatment methods for treating the water from Lake Sakakawea at a water treatment plant in the Missouri River Basin, prior to the water being transported through a buried pipeline to users within the Hudson Bay Basin. In addition, the environmental impacts that could occur due to pipeline leaks and failure of the water treatment systems were evaluated.

A final EIS was published in 2008. Based on the information contained in the final EIS, Reclamation signed a Record of Decision in 2009. Shortly thereafter, the Province of Manitoba filed a supplemental complaint contending the final EIS was insufficient. The State of Missouri also filed a complaint against the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the same District Court. The State of Missouri alleged Reclamation's final EIS was insufficient and the Corps of Engineers failed to complete a separate NEPA assessment for the Project. These two complaints were combined by the District Court.

In March 2010, the court remanded to case to Reclamation and the injunction imposed in 2005 remains in effect. The court found the EIS inadequately examined the cumulative impacts of water withdrawals on Lake Sakakawea and the Missouri River and the consequences of transferring potentially invasive species into the Hudson Bay Basin.

Scoping Process

Scoping is "*an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action*" (40 CFR 1501.7). Thus, the purpose of scoping is to obtain information that will focus the Supplemental EIS on the significant issues. Information gathered in scoping can be used to identify:

- Significant resource issues
- Study participants
- The potentially affected geographic area
- Resources available for the study
- Study constraints
- Alternatives to be considered

It serves as the public's opportunity to provide input and direction on the Supplemental EIS throughout its preparation. Reclamation decided to prepare a Supplemental EIS to address the issues identified by the court in addition to other issues or concerns voiced during public scoping. The purpose of the public scoping process is to inform those persons and agencies who may be interested or affected by the proposed action, as well as to gather input regarding issues and concerns. The public scoping period began with the

publication of a Notice of Intent to prepare a Supplemental EIS in the *Federal Register* on August 12, 2010 (Appendix A). Public scoping meetings were held in September 2010, and written comments were received by October 12, 2010.

Input analyzed for this summary came from the following:

1. A series of public scoping meetings held at four locations in North Dakota (Bottineau, Minot, New Town and Bismarck) during September 2010.
2. Written comments submitted by agencies, Tribes, organizations, and the public.

This summary is based upon both oral and written input from federal, state, and local agencies, Tribes, and other interested persons. Comments were received on the scope of actions, alternatives, and impacts to be studied in the Supplemental EIS.

Scoping Summary

The following breakout is a summary of the comments received. The wording is intended to categorize and summarize the substance of the comments, not reproduce the exact wording of the individual comments. The order which the issues are presented does not reflect their relative importance.

Project Purpose and Need

Many comments reiterated the project need based on current water quality conditions. Their concerns concentrated on continued delays in project construction and completion. Several commenters suggested expanding the project to Glenburn. The Missouri Department of Natural Resources commented that energy extraction should be added to the project description if Reclamation intends to use the water for that purpose.

Alternatives

A suggestion was made to revisit alternatives based on climate change concerns. Another commenter recommended analyzing reasonable project alternatives. Reclamation was asked to examine various treatment alternatives to determine how it would successfully avoid potential catastrophic project consequences.

Cumulative Impacts

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) outlined the steps in a comprehensive cumulative assessment. EPA recommended analyzing cumulative effects on the demand for water, in-lake/in-stream water quantity, water quality, wetlands, the aquatic community, and recreational usage, using quantitative measures when possible and

otherwise using qualitative measures. The EPA recommends that Reclamation characterize the pre-project conditions to disclose the net cumulative effect of historic actions. One commenter asked Reclamation to consider Devils Lake outlet and Red River Valley Water Supply Project in cumulative effects analysis.

Missouri River and Depletions

Comments focused on comprehensive assessment of cumulative effects on the Missouri River. In particular, commenters recommended preparing an updated depletion estimate for the basin, addressing project and new non-project depletions and deficiencies cited in Reclamation's 2005 report. Also, they suggested that Corps of Engineers' models based on conditions from the 1980s and 1990s should not be used. Reclamation was asked to consider tribal claims to water and account for continuing sedimentation in reservoirs. The Missouri Department of Natural Resources suggested that Reclamation work closely with Corps of Engineers to examine current uses of the Missouri River and those uses that can be reasonably expected given recent developments. The Missouri Department of Natural Resources requested Reclamation to coordinate this effort with the Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study and the examination of reallocation of waters within mainstem Missouri River reservoirs. Commenters recommend Reclamation also work closely with the U.S. Geological Survey and state agencies that oversee oil and gas extraction to account for water demand to serve such extraction. One commenter asked Reclamation to consider effects on Mississippi River flows, not just the Missouri River up to its confluence with the Mississippi River. Additionally, the commenter requested Reclamation consider conditions under which water may not be removed from the Missouri River because project purposes of the Corps of Engineers' river management cannot be met. This comment elaborated that the Supplemental EIS should describe the Corps of Engineers' determination of surplus water for the project, as well as explain how the project will not adversely affect other lawful uses of Missouri River water now or in the future.

Invasive Species Transfer

Comments focused on the consequences of invasive species transfer and suggested distinguishing the unique and distinct character of the two basins. In particular, commenters requested that pathogens (disease-producing agents) be addressed (bacteria, viruses, protozoa, rickettsias, fungi and other microscopic plant and animal parasites, eggs, larvae). Specifically mentioned was *Myxobolus cerebralis*, a parasite that attacks trout and other salmonids and is the causative agent of whirling disease. Commenters also recommended discussing the threat that non-native species may pose to ecological integrity, species diversity, rare and endangered species, and composition of natural communities. Commenters wanted to see an evaluation of the treatability of potential species of concern, and the likely success of proposed alternatives, especially in regard to disinfection-resistant protozoa. Reclamation was also requested to address the introduction mechanisms for invasive species to the Hudson Bay Basin, including

catastrophic system failures, normal leakage, discharges of backwash and sludge, and human error.

Other comments focused on determining the invasive species likely to be potentially released by the Project and the comparative ability of alternatives to inactivate disinfectant-resistant pathogens or transport them for treatment in either basin. Commenters would like to see the Supplemental EIS define environmental and economic consequences of invasive species transfer, including decline in native species, loss of rare and endangered species, introduction of new disease, and alteration of gene pools.

Transboundary Effects

Several commenters requested that Reclamation evaluate environmental effects in Canada.

Climate Change

Several commenters suggested that the Supplemental EIS analyze greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions that may be generated by the proposed action. The EPA recommended qualitatively discussing the link among GHGs, climate change and impacts on water resources. The EPA suggested that this include a summary discussion of ongoing and projected regional climate change impacts relevant to the action area based on U.S. Global Change Research Program assessments. The EPA requested that Reclamation identify how it would adapt the proposed action to these effects, if needed, and characterize potential impacts from the proposed action that may be exacerbated by climate change. The EPA also states that because climate change is likely to exacerbate extreme drought and flooding, which the project area already experiences, it may be considered in developing the baseline condition for all alternatives including the no action alternative.

Mitigation Monitoring

The EPA recommends that the Supplemental EIS draft an effective adaptive management plan for mitigation and monitoring efforts.

Construction Impacts

The North Dakota Department of Health noted that construction should minimize adverse effects on water bodies, including stream beds and banks. In addition, the Department of Health mentioned that project construction may require a storm water discharge permit.

Future Public Involvement

Additional opportunities for public involvement and comment will be provided throughout the development of the Supplemental EIS. Newsletters providing updates on various analyses will be sent to entities on our mailing list and information will be posted on the Dakotas Area Office website which is www.usbr.gov/gp/dkao. The public will be notified when the draft Supplemental EIS is available for review and comment. Reclamation will also host public hearings to gather comments on the draft Supplemental EIS.

Appendix A

Northwest Area Water Supply Project Supplemental EIS

Notice of Intent

August 12, 2010

Estimation of the total number of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response:

Number of Respondents	190,000.
Estimate Responses per Respondent	1 every 2 years.
Time (minutes) per Respondent	49.
Total hours to respond	155,167.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

Status of the proposed information collection: Pending OMB approval.

Authority: Title 13 U.S.C. Section 9(a), and Title 12, U.S.C., Section 1701z–1 *et seq.*

Dated: August 3, 2010.

Edward J. Szymanoski,

Acting Director, Division of Housing & Demographic Analysis.

[FR Doc. 2010–19876 Filed 8–11–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

Vendor Outreach Workshop for Small Businesses in the National Capitol Region of the United States

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization of the Department of the Interior are hosting a Vendor Outreach Workshop for small businesses in the National Capitol region of the United States that are interested in doing business with the Department. This outreach workshop will review market contracting opportunities for the attendees. Business owners will be able to share their individual perspectives with Contracting Officers, Program Managers and Small Business Specialists from the Department.

DATES: The workshop will be held on August 31, 2010, from 9 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The workshop will be held at the U.S. Department of the Interior Main Auditorium, 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240. Register online at: *http://www.doi.gov/osdbu.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Oliver, Director, Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, 1951 Constitution Ave., NW., MS–320 SIB, Washington, DC 20240, telephone 1–877–375–9927 (Toll-Free).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with the Small Business Act, as amended by Public Law 95–507, the Department has the responsibility to promote the use of small and small disadvantaged business for its acquisition of goods and services. The Department is proud of its accomplishments in meeting its business goals for small, small disadvantaged, 8(a), woman-owned, HUBZone, and service-disabled veteran-owned businesses. In Fiscal Year 2009, the Department awarded 56 percent of its $2.6 billion in contracts to small businesses.

This fiscal year, the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization are reaching out to our internal stakeholders and the Department's small business community by conducting several vendor outreach workshops. The Department's presenters will focus on contracting and subcontracting opportunities and how small businesses can better market services and products. Over 3,000 small businesses have been targeted for this event. If you are a small business interested in working with the Department, we urge you to register online at: *http://www.doi.gov/osdbu* and attend the workshop.

These outreach events are a new and exciting opportunity for the Department's bureaus and offices to improve their support for small business. Additional scheduled events are posted on the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization website at *http://www.doi.gov/osdbu.*

Mark Oliver,

Director, Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.

[FR Doc. 2010–19951 Filed 8–11–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–RK–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

Northwest Area Water Supply Project, North Dakota

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) is commencing work under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) on a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Northwest Area Water Supply Project (NAWS Project), a Federal reclamation project, located in North Dakota. A Final EIS and Record of Decision (ROD) for the NAWS Project were previously completed in December 2008 and January 2009, respectively. The Final EIS and ROD were challenged in U.S. District Court. A subsequent court order found the Final EIS to be insufficient in two areas. Therefore a supplement is being prepared to address those areas in more detail and any others that interested parties or the public may identify warranting additional analysis, as well as to re-examine and update, to the extent necessary, prior NEPA analysis that has been completed in connection with the NAWS Project to date. This notice is being published to inform the public about the preparation of the Supplemental EIS and to initiate a formal scoping period for obtaining public comment. The scoping period for the supplement will conclude 60 days following publication of this notice. Public meetings are scheduled as part of the scoping process.

Reclamation invites all interested parties to submit written comments or suggestions during the scoping period related to significant issues, environmental impacts, and reasonable alternatives to the proposed action. Reclamation will provide a separate project information document that describes the Supplemental EIS actions and how the public can become involved and participate. The project information document will provide details relative to the Supplemental EIS and is intended to assist the public in providing comments during the scoping period.

DATES: Public scoping meetings will be held during September 2010. See the Supplemental Information section for dates and locations of these meetings. Individuals who want to receive the additional project information document should contact Reclamation within 15 days following publication of this notice. Written or e-mailed comments on the scope of issues and alternatives should be received by October 12, 2010. Comments received

after that date will be considered to the extent practical.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be submitted to: Bureau of Reclamation, Dakotas Area Office, Attention: Alicia Waters, P.O. Box 1017, Bismarck, ND 58502.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alicia Waters, Northwest Area Water Supply Project EIS, Bureau of Reclamation, Dakotas Area Office, P.O. Box 1017, Bismarck, ND 58502; Telephone: (701) 221–1206; or facsimile (701) 250–4326. You may submit e-mail to *NAWS_EIS@usbr.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Dates of Public Scoping Meetings

- September 13, 2010, 6:30 p.m.–8:30 p.m., Bottineau, ND
- September 14, 2010, 6:30 p.m.–8:30 p.m., Minot, ND
- September 15, 2010, 6:30 p.m.–8:30 p.m., New Town, ND
- September 16, 2010, 6:30 p.m.–8:30 p.m., Bismarck, ND

Locations of Public Scoping Meetings

- MSU–Bottineau, Nelson Science Center Room 125, 105 Simrall Boulevard, Bottineau, ND
- Sleep Inn—Inn and Suites, North Convention Center, 2400 10th Street NW., Minot, ND
- 4 Bears Casino, Mandan Room, 202 Frontage Room, New Town, ND
- Best Western Doublewood Inn, Congress Room, 1400 Interchange Avenue, Bismarck, ND

The meeting facilities are physically accessible to people with disabilities. People needing special assistance to attend and/or participate in the public meetings should contact Patience Hurley at 701–221–1204 as soon as possible. To allow sufficient time to process special requests, please call no later than one week before the public meeting of interest.

Background

The Garrison Diversion Unit's Municipal, Rural and Industrial Water Supply (MR&I) program was authorized by the U.S. Congress on May 12, 1986, through the Garrison Diversion Unit Reformulation Act of 1986. This act authorized the appropriation of $200 million of Federal funds for the planning and construction of water supply facilities throughout North Dakota. The NAWS Project is being constructed under this authorization.

The NAWS Project is designed as a bulk water distribution system that will service local communities and rural water systems in 10 counties in northwestern North Dakota including the community of Minot. The NAWS Project would convey water from Lake Sakakawea, in the Missouri River Basin in North Dakota, through a buried pipeline to Minot, surrounding communities and rural water systems in the Hudson Bay Basin. The Project would include a treatment plant in the Missouri River Basin to disinfect the water prior to it being delivered through the pipeline into the Hudson Bay Basin. An Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) were completed for the Project in 2001.

Construction on the project began in April 2002. In October 2002, the Province of Manitoba, Canada, filed a legal challenge in U.S. District Court in Washington, DC to compel the Department of the Interior to complete an EIS on the project. A court order dated February 3, 2005, remanded the case to Reclamation for completion of additional environmental analysis, but allowed construction to proceed on project features that would not preclude a future decision on water treatment to reduce the risk of transferring invasive species.

Project construction has continued as allowed by the court. Between 2002 and 2010, the entire 45 miles of main transmission pipeline for NAWS, from Lake Sakakawea to Minot, was completed along with several segments of the distribution system. The City of Minot is temporarily serving water to several communities and rural water systems with water from the city's ground water wells. This interim water supply is provided by the city through temporary water service contracts which expire in 2018 or sooner depending on the reliability of the water source.

Recently completed features of the NAWS Project include a high service pump station and 2 million gallon storage reservoir in Minot. Most of the other segments of the distribution system are being designed or constructed. The court also allowed the State of North Dakota to initiate design work on upgrades to the existing Minot water treatment plant which are necessary for the city to continue delivering the interim water supply to adjacent communities.

In March 2006, Reclamation initiated an EIS focused on different water treatment methods for the water from Lake Sakakawea. The analysis focused on environmental impacts that could occur due to pipeline leaks and failure of the water treatment systems. The Draft EIS was published on December 21, 2007 and the Final EIS on December 5, 2008 (documents available electronically at *http://www.usbr.gov/gp/dkao/*). Reclamation signed a Record of Decision (ROD) on January 15, 2009, selecting an alternative using chlorination and ultraviolet radiation to disinfect the water before it is delivered into the Hudson Bay Basin. Final treatment to drinking water standards would occur at the existing water treatment plant in Minot.

In February 2009, the Department of Justice notified the court that Reclamation had completed the Final EIS and ROD. Shortly thereafter, the Province of Manitoba filed a supplemental complaint contending the Final EIS was insufficient. Additionally, the State of Missouri filed a complaint against the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the same District Court in Washington, DC. The State of Missouri alleged that Reclamation's Final EIS was insufficient and that the Corps of Engineers failed to complete a separate National Environmental Policy Act assessment for the NAWS Project. The court combined the Missouri suit with the Manitoba suit. On March 5, 2010, the court issued an order in favor of the Province of Manitoba and the State of Missouri. The case was remanded to Reclamation and the injunction imposed by the April 15, 2005, order remains in effect.

The Court found the EIS inadequately examined: (1) Cumulative impacts of water withdrawals on Lake Sakakawea and the Missouri River, and (2) consequences of transferring potentially invasive species into the Hudson Bay Basin.

Purpose of the Proposed Action

The purpose of the proposed action is to provide a reliable source of high quality treated water to northwestern North Dakota for MR&I uses.

Need for the Proposed Action

The NAWS Project is needed: (1) To provide high quality treated water because northwestern North Dakota has experienced water supply problems for many years, (2) to replace poor quality groundwater sources presently used for MR&I purposes, and (3) because the surface water supplies within the service area are insufficient from both a quality and quantity standpoint. This Supplemental EIS is needed to comply with the Court order of March 5, 2010, and fully satisfy NEPA. Reclamation will conduct additional analyses to address the Court's order regarding the consequences of transferring potentially invasive species into the Hudson Bay Basin and the cumulative impacts of water withdrawals on Lake Sakakawea and the Missouri River, in addition to

re-examining and updating all prior NEPA analysis that has been completed in connection with the NAWS Project to date.

The Proposed Action

Reclamation proposes to complete construction of the NAWS Project, including construction of a biota water treatment plant, to treat the source water from Lake Sakakawea before it is transported into the Hudson Bay drainage. As part of this proposed action, Reclamation would implement construction methods and operational measures to further reduce the risk of invasive species transfer that may occur as a result of an interruption in the treatment process and breach in the buried pipeline to the Minot water treatment plant.

Scope of the Proposed Action

The geographic scope of the Supplemental EIS will include areas and resources within the Missouri River Basin and Hudson Bay Basin that may be affected by water diversion and delivery for NAWS project purposes. This includes, but is not necessarily limited to: (1) The sites of NAWS Project features and facilities; (2) lands and waters that receive NAWS Project MR&I water supplies, including downstream areas in the Hudson Bay Basin; and (3) the Missouri River from Lake Sakakawea to its confluence with the Mississippi River.

The Supplemental EIS will review, and update, if necessary, the prior Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Statement. This Supplemental EIS will further evaluate the consequences of transferring potentially invasive species to the Hudson Bay Basin and the cumulative effects of water withdrawals from the Missouri River. Additional issues or concerns identified in the scoping process will be considered by Reclamation and evaluated in the Supplemental EIS as appropriate. Identification of known methods and technologies that can be used to assess potential consequences to resources will be considered as well.

Summary

Reclamation is preparing a Supplemental EIS to address the relevant issues related to final construction and operation of the NAWS Project. We are seeking comment from the public on the development of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, information relative to new water treatment processes that could be considered, methods for evaluating the risks and potential consequences which may be associated with the proposed action, and concerns relative to the environmental effects that should be described in the supplement. We also seek identification of any issues in prior NEPA analyses for the NAWS Project to date that should be updated, and the identification of any other issues that should be addressed by the Supplemental EIS.

Public Disclosure Statement

Before including your name, address, telephone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

John F. Soucy,

Assistant Regional Director, Great Plains Region, Bureau of Reclamation.

[FR Doc. 2010–19903 Filed 8–11–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MN–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program Project Performance Reports, Conversion of Use Provisions, and Grant Agreements and Amendments

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, we (National Park Service, NPS) have sent three interrelated Information Collection Requests (ICRs) to OMB for renewal (OMB Control Numbers 1024–0028, 1024–0048, and 1024–0089). We summarize each ICR below and describe the nature of the collection and the estimated burden. These ICRs are scheduled to expire on August 31, 2010. We may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. However, under OMB regulations, we may continue to conduct or sponsor this information collection while it is pending at OMB.

DATES: Submit comments on any or all of these ICRs on or before September 13, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Send your comments and suggestions on these ICRs to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior at OMB–OIRA at (202) 395–5806 (fax) or *OIRA_DOCKET@OMB.eop.gov* (e-mail). Please provide a copy of your comments to Cartina Miller, Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service, at 202–371–2049 (fax) or *Cartina_Miller@nps.gov* (e-mail). Please specify the appropriate OMB control number(s) in the subject line of your comment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laurie Heupel, Outdoor Recreation Planner, State and Local Assistance Programs, National Park Service, 1849 C Street NW., Mail Stop 2225, Washington, DC 20240 (mail) or phone: 202–354–6914. You are entitled to a copy of the ICR packages free of charge.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Congress passed the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) Act (16 U.S.C. 2501 *et seq.*) as Title X of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978. The UPARR Act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to establish a grant program to help physically and economically distressed urban areas improve recreation opportunities for their residents. We administer the UPARR program in accordance with regulations at 36 CFR 72. While the program has remained authorized, it has not been funded since Fiscal Year 2002. It may receive funding in the future, and we are seeking renewal of the following information collections associated with the UPARR program:

1. Performance Reports

Title: Urban Park and Recovery Project Performance Report, 36 CFR 72.

OMB Control Number: 1024–0028.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection of information.

Brief Description of Collection: Project Performance Reports include the scheduled completion date, percent completed to date, and percent to be completed at the end of next report period. We also ask for the percent of costs expended to date and the percent of costs to be expended by the end of the next reporting period. Reasons for delays or cost adjustments are described in the report. We use the information: (1) To monitor against possible waste, fraud, and abuse; (2) for billing and audit purposes; and (3) to prepare reports to Congress as necessary.

Affected Public: Local governments.

Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

Frequency of Response: Annually for active grants.

Estimated Total Annual Responses: 1.

Estimated Completion Time per Response: 1 hour.