

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY****Federal Energy Regulatory Commission****Notice of Amendment of Licenses**

April 3, 1998.

Take notice that the following hydroelectric application has been filed with the Commission and is available for public inspection:

a. *Type of Application:* Amendment of licenses.

b. *Project Nos:* 2142-026, 2284-017, 2335-017.

c. *Date Filed:* March 23, 1998.

d. *Applicant:* Central Maine Power Company.

e. *Name of Projects:* Indian Pond (Harris), Brunswick, and Williams.

f. *Location:* Indian Pond: On Kennebec River, Somerset and Piscataquis Counties, Maine; Brunswick: On Androscaggin River, Cumberland and Sagadahoc Counties, Maine; Williams: On Kennebec River, Somerset County, Maine.

g. *Filed Pursuant to:* Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. 791(a)-825(r).

h. *Applicant Contact:* F. Allen Wiley, P.E., Managing Director of Generation, Central Maine Power Company, 46 Anthony Ave., Augusta, Maine 04330, Tel: (207) 621-4412.

i. *FERC Contact:* Mohamad Fayyad, (202) 219-2665.

j. *Comment Date:* April 23, 1998.

k. *Description of Amendments:* Licensee proposes to delete from projects' boundaries transmission lines that are no longer considered primary lines, as follows:

Harris Project: Licensee proposes to delete about 29.5-mile-long transmission line and related facilities from the project's boundary. This line is now part of the licensee's interconnected transmission system.

Brunswick: Licensee proposes to delete about 0.25-mile-long transmission line and related facilities from the project's boundary. This line is now part of the licensee's interconnected transmission system.

Williams: Licensee proposes to delete about 3,900-foot-long transmission line and related facilities from the project's boundary. This line is now part of the licensee's interconnected transmission system.

l. This notice also consists of the following standard paragraphs: B, C1, and D2.

B. Comments, Protests, or Motions to Intervene—Anyone may submit comments, a protest, or a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of Rules of Practice and

Procedure, 18 CFR 385.210, .211, .214. In determining the appropriate action to take, the Commission will consider all protests or other comments filed, but only those who file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules may become a party to the proceeding. Any comments, protests, or motions to intervene must be received on or before the specified comment date for the particular application.

C1. Filing and Service of Responsive Documents—Any filings must bear in all capital letters the title "COMMENTS", "RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS", "PROTEST", OR "MOTION TO INTERVENE", as applicable, and the Project Number of the particular application to which the filing refers. Any of the above-named documents must be filed by providing the original and the number of copies provided by the Commission's regulations to: The Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. A copy of any motion to intervene must also be served upon each representative of the Applicant specified in the particular application.

D2. Agency Comments—Federal, state, and local agencies are invited to file comments on the described application. A copy of the application may be obtained by agencies directly from the Applicant. If an Agency does not file comments within the time specified for filing comments, it will be presumed to have no comments. One copy of an agency's comments must also be sent to the Applicant's representatives.

**Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,**

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98-9293 Filed 4-8-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[AD-FRL-5993-7]

**Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Electric Utility Steam Generating Unit Mercury Emissions Collection Effort**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that EPA is planning to submit the

following proposed Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB): Electric Utility Steam Generating Unit Mercury Emissions Information Collection Effort Information Collection Request; EPA ICR No. 1858.01. 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 June 8, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** *Comments.* Comments should be submitted (in duplicate, if possible) to: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center (6102), Attention Docket No. A-92-55, Room M-1500, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. The EPA requests that a separate copy also be sent to Mr. William Maxwell, Combustion Group (MD-13), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711.

**Copies of ICR**

The draft ICR and other relevant materials, including the draft supporting statement, are available from the docket at the above address in Room M-1500, Waterside Mall (ground floor), phone number (202) 260-7548. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying. The docket is open for public inspection and copying between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. Copies of the draft ICR may also be obtained free of charge from the EPA's website listing **Federal Register** Notices at "<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/oarpg/t3pfpr.html>" or by contacting one of the people listed below.

**Public Meeting**

The EPA plans to hold a public meeting in Washington, D.C., at which time interested parties can provide comment on this ICR. A document will be published in the near future in the **Federal Register** announcing the date, time, and location of this meeting.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For information concerning specific aspects of this ICR, contact Mr. William Maxwell [telephone number (919) 541-5430; facsimile number (919) 541-5450; e-mail "[maxwell.bill@epa.gov](mailto:maxwell.bill@epa.gov)"], Combustion Group, Emission Standards Division (MD-13); or Mr. William Grimley [telephone number (919) 541-1065; facsimile number (919) 541-1039; e-mail "[grimley.william@epa.gov](mailto:grimley.william@epa.gov)"], Emission Measurement Center,

Emission Monitoring and Analysis Division (MD-19), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Affected entities:** Entities potentially affected by this action are owners and operators of coal-fired electric utility steam generating units as defined by section 112(a)(8) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (the Act).

**Title:** Electric Utility Steam Generating Unit Mercury Emissions Information Collection Effort Information Collection Request; EPA ICR No. 1858.01.

**Abstract:** Section 112(n)(1)(A) of the Act requires EPA to perform a study of the hazards to public health reasonably anticipated to occur as a result of emissions by electric utility steam generating units of hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) after imposition of the requirements of the Act and to prepare a Report to Congress containing the results of the study. The Agency is to proceed with rulemaking activities under section 112 to control HAP emissions from utilities if EPA finds such regulation is appropriate and necessary after considering the results of the study. The study has been completed and the Final Report to Congress was issued on February 24, 1998.

In the Final Report to Congress, the EPA stated that mercury is the HAP emission of greatest potential concern from coal-fired utilities and that additional research and monitoring are merited. The EPA also listed a number of research needs related to such mercury emissions. These include obtaining additional data on the mercury content of various types of coal as burned in electric utility steam generating units and additional data on mercury emissions to the atmosphere (e.g., how much is emitted from various types of units; how much is divalent vs. elemental mercury; and how do factors such as control device, fuel type, and plant configuration affect emissions and speciation).

As indicated above, section 112(n)(1)(A) of the Act requires the Administrator to regulate electric utility steam generating units under section 112 if the Administrator finds that such regulation is appropriate and necessary after "considering the results of the study" noted above. The Administrator interprets the quoted language as indicating that the results of the study are to play a principle, but not exclusive, role in informing the Administrator's decision as to whether it is appropriate and necessary to

regulate electric utility steam generating units under section 112. The Administrator believes that in addition to considering the results of the study, she may consider any other available information in making her decision. The Administrator also believes that she is authorized to collect and evaluate any additional information which may be necessary to make an informed decision.

After carefully considering the Final Report to Congress, the Administrator has concluded that obtaining additional information under the authority of section 114 of the Act prior to making the required determination is appropriate. In the Final Report to Congress, the EPA stated that at this time, the available information, on balance, indicates that utility mercury emissions are of sufficient potential concern for public health to merit further research and monitoring. The EPA acknowledged that there are substantial uncertainties that make it difficult to quantify the magnitude of the risks due to utility mercury emissions, and that further research and/or evaluation would be needed to reduce those uncertainties. The EPA believes that among those uncertainties are: (i) the actual cumulative amount of mercury being emitted by all electric utility steam generating units on an annual basis; (ii) the speciation of the mercury which is being emitted; and, (iii) the effectiveness of various control technologies in reducing the volume of each form of mercury which is emitted.

To address the question of the cumulative amount of mercury potentially being emitted by all electric utility steam generating units on an annual basis, the EPA believes that it is necessary to require the owners/operators of all such units to provide information on the mercury content of the coal burned in each unit as well as the volume of coal burned in each unit. Thus, the ICR includes a requirement for the owners/operators of all coal-fired electric utility steam generating units with a capacity greater than 25 megawatts electric (MWe) to periodically measure the mercury content of the coal which they burn on a weekly basis and report the results together with the corresponding volume of coal burned in each unit.

In preparing the Final Report to Congress, the Agency had available mercury emission data from a number of utility boilers. These data included measurements of the mercury emitted during various stages of the process (e.g., exiting the boiler, exiting the various control devices). Research conducted during the period between acquisition of these data and release of

the report has highlighted the importance of the specific valence state of the emitted mercury on the ability of a particular control device to remove mercury from the exhaust gas stream. In addition, advances have been made in emission testing methodologies that more accurately differentiate among the various species of mercury that may be emitted from an electric utility steam generating unit. Thus, the ICR also includes provisions for acquiring additional speciated mercury data on both controlled and uncontrolled air emissions so that the relationship between mercury content and other characteristics of the coal, the species of mercury formed in the boiler, and the mercury removal performance of various control devices may be further evaluated.

Although the actual variables that affect mercury speciation are still being determined in ongoing research efforts, two variables that appear to have an effect are coal characteristics and scrubber type. For purposes of grouping the coal-fired units (boilers) into categories, these two variables were used so that a more representative sample of coal-fired units can be selected for testing. Coal characteristics are related to the coal type, which is defined as either bituminous (including anthracite for this ICR), subbituminous, or lignite. Scrubber type is defined as either a dry-scrubber (of any type/model), wet-scrubber (of any type/model), or no scrubber at all.

**ICR Description:** To address the issues related to coal characteristics, this ICR requires that the owner/operator of each facility at which one or more individual coal-fired unit(s) (boiler(s)) is (are) located (there are approximately 421 nationwide) provide periodic analyses of all coals fired. This would be accomplished by obtaining weekly as-fired coal analyses from each distinct coal storage pile, including silos, etc., in use at the facility, rather than from each boiler located at the facility. In this way, information will be provided from which the amount of mercury entering each of the approximately 1,017 coal-fired boilers (nationwide) may be estimated at a minimum burden level for any given facility. It would also be necessary to measure and record the amount of coal burned in each week and identify the source of the coal (e.g., State, seam, etc.). Each coal sample would be analyzed using one of several standardized analytical methods for mercury, chlorine, and other specified items. These analyses would be obtained either by direct sampling and analysis by each owner/operator or by submission of suitable analyses

provided by the coal supplier. Analyses performed by the coal supplier would not be considered suitable if the coal would subsequently be cleaned at the facility where the electric utility steam generating unit(s) is (are) located. The Agency will ultimately apply appropriate correction factors to these data to derive a reasonable estimate of the total amount of mercury emitted by each coal-fired electric utility steam generating unit on an annual basis. To better evaluate whether mercury emissions from coal-fired electric utility steam generating units vary over time and to provide information to the public on mercury emissions over time, the Agency is considering requiring coal sampling and emissions reporting to be conducted for a number of years.

To address the issues related to scrubber type, this ICR also requires that quarterly, triplicate simultaneous before/after control device stack sampling be performed by a subset of boilers using a specified mercury speciation method. During the stack testing, a statistically appropriate number of coal samples would be required to be collected for analysis. When dealing with a large population (approximately 1,017 individual boilers) of this nature with consideration being made for the cost of the data collection effort (which involves sampling the fewest number of units possible without compromising the integrity of the data being collected), a statistically representative sample is considered to be 30. These samples can be selected in one of two ways: equally among the viable categories or proportional allocation of sample to stratified population (units within each category). The universe of boilers was divided into nine scrubber type/coal characteristic categories. One possible category had no members, leaving eight viable categories. A proportional allocation methodology was selected, with provisions being made for having at least two members selected from each category (assessing one sample would provide no basis for comparison).

A random selection process will be used to determine what units are required to participate in this testing program. If possible, once a unit from a particular site (facility) has been selected, no other unit(s) at that site will be chosen for that particular category (i.e., some facilities have units with different scrubber types or that burn coal from different sources). This will provide the Agency with more information from a larger number of facilities. Appropriate quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC)

procedures would be required for each part of the ICR.

**Burden Statement:** 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.

The total annual reporting and recordkeeping burden for this ICR is estimated to be 40,516 hours and \$14,659,264. This is the estimated burden for 421 facilities to provide coal analyses (assuming no more than two coal storage piles per facility) and 30 units to provide speciated mercury emission data. The average annual base reporting and recordkeeping burden and cost for this information collection for facilities having units subject only to the first component of the mercury emissions data gathering effort is 37 hours and \$22,925. The average annual per electric utility steam generating unit base reporting and recordkeeping burden and cost for this information collection for units subject to the second component of the mercury emissions data gathering effort is 174 hours and \$166,928. This ICR does not include any requirements that would cause the respondents to incur either capital and start-up costs or operation and maintenance costs. The EPA has assumed that all respondents will contract (i.e., purchase services) for the weekly coal analyses and for the quarterly stack testing. These costs are \$8,804,800 for the coal analyses and \$4,800,000 for the stack testing.

#### Request for Comments

The EPA solicits comments on the following aspects of the ICR itself.

1. Will the information that the Agency proposes to collect have practical utility in informing the Administrator's decision on whether it is appropriate and necessary to regulate HAP emissions from electric utility steam generating units under section 112 of the Act?

2. Is the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of

the methodology and assumptions used, accurate?

3. Are there ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the Agency best minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond? 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)?

The Agency also solicits comment on the following specific technical issues.

1. What is the exact amount, representativeness, and sufficiency of information on the mercury content of as-fired coal that already exists?

2. To what extent are analyses of mercury in as-fired coal currently being performed?

3. Do coal analyses performed on cleaned coal by coal suppliers accurately represent as-fired coal to the same degree as analyses of actual on-site samples?

4. What factors could increase or decrease the number of individual samples needed to identify with reasonable certainty an average annual mercury in coal value for a particular unit?

5. What is the minimum number of individual samples required for a particular unit to identify with reasonable certainty an average annual mercury in coal value?

6. Would a statistical sampling approach provide comprehensive data on the mercury content of the total volume of as-fired coal burned in electric utility steam generating units comparable in quality and reliability to that obtained by requiring the sampling of all such coals?

7. Could a particular facility be placed at a competitive disadvantage due to a disproportionate cost burden in either the coal or stack testing?

8. What is the specific amount, representativeness, and sufficiency of information on the speciation of mercury in stack gases that already exists or is currently being collected?

9. What difficulties in sampling at those sources selected for stack testing might occur due to unusual operating or physical characteristics?

10. Would requiring coal sampling and analyses for more than one year provide information that would be valuable to the public, as well as allow the Agency to better evaluate whether the characteristics of the as-fired coal burned in electric utility steam generating units vary over time and the impact of any such variation on mercury

emissions? The Agency seeks comment also on how best to design a mercury monitoring protocol beyond the first year.

Finally, the Agency requests comment on the following four general questions.

1. Are there other approaches to obtaining the desired information that the Agency could take which would provide data of comparable, or better, quality at a reduced burden?

2. Will the information which the Agency proposes to collect provide the Administrator with all of the information on the quantity and speciation of mercury emissions from electric utility steam generating units needed to determine whether it is appropriate and necessary to regulate HAP emissions from electric utility steam generating units under section 112 of the Act and to develop appropriate regulations if the Administrator determines that such regulation is appropriate and necessary?

3. Does the population of electric utility steam generating units from which the Agency proposes to obtain information (i.e., approximately 1,017 coal-fired boilers at approximately 421 facilities) adequately reflect the true population that meets the section 112(a)(8) definition (i.e., a population that may include publicly-owned utility companies, rural electric cooperatives, investor-owned utility generating companies, and non-utility generators)?

4. Is there any other information which the Agency should obtain to inform the Administrator's decision of whether it is appropriate and necessary to regulate HAP emissions from electric utility steam generating units under section 112 of the Act?

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information that is sent to ten or more persons unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's approved information collection requests are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15. This notice is the first step in obtaining approval for the ICR described above.

Dated: April 3, 1998.

**Richard D. Wilson,**

*Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 98-9390 Filed 4-8-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5993-6]

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; The Class V Underground Injection Control Study

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that the following Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval: The Class V Underground Injection Control Study (ICR# 1834.01). The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden and cost; where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instrument.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before June 8, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Contact Sandy Farmer at EPA by phone at (202) 260-2740, by email at [farmer.sandy@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:farmer.sandy@epamail.epa.gov), or download off the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/icr> and refer to EPA ICR No. 1834.01.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

**Title:** The Class V Underground Injection Control Study (ICR# 1834.01). This is a new collection of information.

**Abstract:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (OGWDW) will collect information on Class V injection wells. This information collection will be conducted to meet the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) and EPA's modified consent decree with the Sierra Club.<sup>1</sup> The consent decree requires EPA, in part, to study Class V wells. The results of this study will be used by EPA to determine whether additional regulations are needed for certain Class V wells and to develop those regulations if necessary.

The objective of the Class V study is to gather information on Class V wells. This information will enable EPA to characterize the nationwide risk Class V wells pose to underground sources of drinking water (USDWs). To achieve this objective, EPA must have information on the number of wells by subclass and the risk posed by each

subclass. EPA will collect information on each subclass of Class V well using two types of data collection: (1) collection of existing information from State agencies, EPA Regional offices, organizations and businesses by mail, telephone, and file searches; and (2) enumeration of the number and types of wells in study areas collected by site visits to those areas. Data collected during this study will be analyzed and stored in databases maintained by OGWDW.

Responses to this ICR are voluntary and no assurances of confidentiality will be provided to those who participate in the data collection effort.

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 **Federal Register** document required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on December 18, 1997. No comments were received.

**Burden Statement:** The annual public reporting and record keeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 28 minutes per response. 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.

**Respondent/Affected Entities:** Owners and operators of Class V wells.

**Estimated Number of Respondents:** 3448.

**Frequency of Response:** 1.

**Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden:** 1634 hours.

**Estimated Total Annualized Cost Burden:** \$45,557.50.

Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including through the use of automated collection

<sup>1</sup> *Sierra Club v. Carol M. Browner*, Civil Action No. 93-2644 NHJ, 1997.