Douglas W. Smith Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–30632 Filed 11–20–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

# **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[FRL-5926-1]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; "Clean Water Act State Revolving Fund Program"

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA). **ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that EPA is planning to submit the following continuing Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB):

Clean Water Act State Revolving Fund Program, EPA ICR Number 1391.04, OMB Control Number 2040–118, and current expiration date of 02/28/98. Before submitting the ICR to OMB for review and approval, EPA is soliciting comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection as described below.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before January 20, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Clifford Yee, Office of Wastewater Management (4204), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC. 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Clifford Yee (202) 260–5822; FAX: (202) 260-0116; E-Mail: yee.clifford@epamail.epa.gov.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Affected entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are the fifty States, Puerto Rico, and the recipients of assistance in each of these jurisdictions.

*Title:* Clean Water Act State Revolving Fund Program; OMB Control No. 2040–0118; EPA ICR No. 1391.04; expiring 02/28/98.

Abstract: The Clean Water Act, as amended by "The Water Quality Act of 1987" (U.S.C. 1381–1387 et. Seq.),

created a Title VI which authorizes grants to States for the establishment of State Water Pollution Control Revolving Funds (SRFs). The information activities are pursuant to Section 606 of the Act, and SRF Interim Final Rule (March 1990). The 1987 Act declares that water pollution control revolving loan funds shall be administered by an instrumentality of the State subject to the requirements of the act. This means that each State has a general responsibility for administering its revolving fund, and must take on certain specific responsibilities in carrying out its administrative duties. The information collection activities will occur primarily at the program level through the State Intended Use Plan and Annual Report. The information is needed annually to implement Section 606 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The Act requires the information to ensure national accountability, adequate public comment and review, fiscal integrity and consistent management directed to achieve environmental objectives. The individual information collections are: (1) Capitalization Grant Application and Agreement/ State Intended Use Plan, (2) Annual Report, (3) State Audit, and (4) Application for SRF Financial Assistance.

- (1) Capitalization Grant Application and Agreement / State Intended Use Plan: The State will prepare a capitalization grant application that includes an Intended Use Plan (IUP) outlining in detail how it will use all the funds available to the Fund. The grant agreement contains or incorporates by reference the IUP, application materials, payment schedule, and required assurances. The bulk of the information is provided in the IUP. The legal agreement which commits the State and EPA to execute their responsibilities under the Act.
- (2) Annual Report: The State will agree to complete and submit an annual report that indicates how the State has met the goals and objectives of the previous fiscal year as stated in the IUP and grant agreement. The Report provides information on loan recipients, loan amounts, loan terms, project categories, and similar data on other forms of assistance. The Report describes the extent to which the existing SRF financial operating policies, alone or in combination with

other State financial assistance programs, will provide for the long term fiscal health of the Fund and carry out other provisions specified in the grant operating agreement.

- (3) Annual Audit: Most States have agreed to conduct or have conducted a separate financial audit of the capitalization grant which will provide opinions on the financial statements, and a report on the internal controls and compliance with program requirements. The remaining States will be covered by audits conducted under the requirements of the Single Audit Act and by EPA's Office of Inspector General.
- (4) Applications for SRF Financing Assistance: Local communities and other eligible entities have to prepare and submit applications for SRF assistance to their respective State Agency which manages the SRF program. The State reviews the completed loan applications, and verifies that the proposed projects will comply with applicable Federal and State requirements.

An agency 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. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15.

The EPA would like to solicit comments to:

- (i) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- (ii) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- (iii) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- (iv) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

#### **BURDEN STATEMENT**

#### 

### BURDEN STATEMENT—Continued

2000	51 States×400 Hours	=	20,400 Burden Hours.
(2) Annual Report			
1998 1999 2000	51 States×275 Hours	= = =	14,025 Burden Hours. 14,025 Burden Hours. 14,025 Burden Hours.
(3) State Annual Audit			
1998 1999 2000	51 States×80 Hours	= = =	4,080 Burden Hours. 4,080 Burden Hours. 4,080 Burden Hours.
(4) Applications for SRF Financing Assistance			
1998 1999 2000	51 States×29 Applications×40 Hours	= = =	48,960 Hours. 59,160 Hours. 69,360 Hours.
1998 1999 2000		= = =	73,440 Burden Hours. 88,740 Burden Hours. 104,040 Burden Hours.

Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Dated: November 14, 1997.

#### Michael B. Cook,

Director, Office of Wastewater Management. [FR Doc. 97–30657 Filed 11–20–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-5486-4]

# **Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability**

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 OR (202) 564–7153.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed November 10, 1997 Through November 14, 1997 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9. EIS No. 970446, Draft EIS, BLM, MT, Golden Sunlight Mine Expansion, Implementation of Amendment 008 to Operating Permit No. 0065, COE Section 404 Permit, Whitehall, Jefferson County MT, Due: January 21, 1998, Contact: David Williams (406) 494–5059.

EIS No. 970447, Final EIS, AFS, SD, Anchor Hill Mine Expansion Project in Gilt Edge Mine, Plan-of-Operations, Approval, Black Hills National Forest, SD, Due: January 05, 1998, Contact: Don Murray (605) 578–2744.

EIS No. 970448, Draft EIS, USN, CA, Miramar Naval Air Station Realignment of E–2 Aircraft Squadrons, Three Installations are consider: Point Muga Naval Air Weapons Station, Lemoore Navel Air Station and El Centro, Ventura Fresno, King and Imperial Counties, CA, Due: January 05, 1998, Contact: Ms. Kelly Knight (619) 532–2456.

EIS No. 970449, Final EIS, USN, CA, Novato, California Department of Defense Housing Facility Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, City of Novato, Marin County, CA, Due: December 22, 1997, Contact: Gary J. Munekawa (650) 244–3022.

EIS No. 970450, Draft EIS, USN, HI, Fort Kamehameha Outfall Replacement for Wastewater Treatment Plant, Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, HI, Due: January 05, 1998, Contact: Gary Kasaoke (808) 471–9338.

EIS No. 970451, Draft EIS, DOE, CO, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Scrub Alloy Stored for Disposal or other Disposition, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, Golden, CO, Due: January 05, 1998, Contact: Charles Head (202) 586–5151. Dated: November 18, 1997.

#### B. Katherine Biggs,

Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities. [FR Doc. 97–30695 Filed 11–20–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-5486-5]

# Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared November 03, 1997 Through November 07, 1997 pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at (202) 564–7167. An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 11, 1997 (62 FR 16154).

### Final EISs

ERP No. F-COE-E40764-00, Fort Campbell Rail Connector, Construction between the Government-Owned Line Railroad and CSX Line, Hopkinsville and Clarkville, Christian Co., KY and Montgomery and Stewart Counties, TN.

Summary: EPA continued to express concern over the potential impacts of the preferred alternative, and suggested that Alternative 3 be selected instead in order to minimize long-term impacts to water and air quality.