

Game and Fish Department (WGFD) responded to Western's Notice of Floodplain Involvement expressing concerns over increased water velocity in the immediate vicinity of the work, as well as upstream and downstream. Western is planning to undertake a transmission line structure protection measure that includes redirecting approximately 60 feet of the Little Laramie River, located northwest of Laramie, Albany County, Wyoming. Structure 82/2 of the Miracle Mile-Cheyenne No. 1 115-kilovolt (kV) transmission line is located within a small ox bow bend of the Little Laramie River. The river has eroded the stream bank to within 3 feet of the base of the structure. The structure is at risk of failure due to ongoing stream bank erosion. If the current rate of erosion continues, the structure could potentially fail during the year 2000 spring runoff, or sooner. Western needs to correct the situation immediately to avoid interruption of electrical service, maintain system reliability, and avoid potential harmful effects that could result from the failure of the electrical transmission line. Per a review of the flood hazard maps for Albany County, Western determined that redirecting the flow of the river around the transmission line structure involves the 100-year floodplain of the Little Laramie River. The transmission line consists of wood pole, H-frame structures carrying three-phase electric power. The Miracle Mile-Cheyenne No. 1 transmission line was put into service in 1960 as part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program.

Western is proposing to cut a channel between the two arms of the ox bow, which will divert the stream flow behind and south of Structure 82/2. A back hoe will be used to cut the new channel, which will be approximately 60 feet in length. All spoil dirt will be removed and placed away from the stream. The channel will be cut from the downstream side to the upstream side to prevent any spoil material from entering the stream. At this location, the stream is approximately 8 feet wide and a few inches to a foot in depth during low flow conditions.

Western considered alternatives to its proposed action, including no action, installing new structures to span the Little Laramie River, and the installation of rip-rap to stabilize the river banks of the ox bow at structure 82/2. The installation of new structures and/or rip-rap would not have avoided impacts to the floodplain. The no action alternative would not have resolved the risk to structure 82/2.

In response to WGFD concerns, a qualified hydrologist has conducted a

field review of Western's proposal and alternatives, and determined that diverting the stream is not expected to increase water velocity at the work site, or water velocity upstream or downstream of the work site. Diverting the stream into the new channel is not expected to have any measurable effect on flood storage volume or impact floodplain characteristics down stream. There will be no new structures placed in the floodplain. The proposed activity would occur during annual minimum flow conditions. The action would conform with applicable State or local floodplain protection standards. This action is categorically excluded under the DOE's NEPA Implementing Procedures (10 CFR part 1021).

Dated: November 29, 1999.

**Michael S. Hacsakaylo,**  
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 99-32052 Filed 12-9-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[AZ-020-NOA; FRL-6506-8]

### Adequacy Status of the Maricopa County, Arizona Submitted PM-10 Attainment Plan for Transportation Conformity Purposes

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of Inadequacy Determination.

**SUMMARY:** In this notice, EPA is notifying the public that we have found that the submitted Maricopa County (Phoenix, Arizona) serious area particulate matter (PM-10) attainment plan is inadequate for transportation conformity purposes. As a result of our finding, the Maricopa Association of Governments and the Federal Highway Administration cannot use the PM-10 motor vehicle emissions budget from the submitted plan for future conformity determinations.

**DATES:** This determination is effective December 27, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The finding is available at EPA's conformity website: <http://www.epa.gov/oms/traq>, (once there, click on the "Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity"). You may also contact Karina O'Connor, U.S. EPA, Region IX, Air Division AIR-2, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105; (415) 744-1247 or [occonnor.karina@epa.gov](mailto:occonnor.karina@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## Background:

This notice announces our finding that the *MAG 1999 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM-10 for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area*, submitted by the Arizona on July 8, 1999, is inadequate for transportation conformity purposes. EPA Region IX made this finding in a letter to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality and the Maricopa Association of Governments on December 1, 1999. We are also announcing this finding on our conformity website: <http://www.epa.gov/oms/traq>, (once there, click on the "Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity").

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. Our conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to state air quality implementation plans (SIPs) and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.

The criteria by which we determine whether a SIP's motor vehicle emission budgets are adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). One of these criterion is that the plan provide for attainment of the relevant ambient air quality standard by the applicable Clean Air Act attainment date. We have preliminarily determined that the Maricopa County PM-10 plan does not provide for attainment of the PM-10 standards and therefore, cannot be found adequate.

This inadequacy finding is separate from and does not affect our August 4, 1999 finding that the plan is complete under section 110(k)(1) of the Clean Air Act.

We have described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in guidance (May 14, 1999 memo titled "Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision"). We followed this guidance in making our inadequacy determination on the Maricopa County PM-10 plan.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671 q.

Date December 1, 1999.

**Alexis Strauss,**

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 99-32077 Filed 12-9-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-U**