

The location of the project facilities is shown in appendix 1.² If you are interested in obtaining procedural information, please write to the Secretary of the Commission.

Land Requirements for Construction

Construction of the proposed facilities would require a total of about 139 acres of land including extra work spaces for road crossings. All of this land would revert to its former agricultural use following construction. No new permanent right-of-way would be required.

The EA Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. We call this "scoping." The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this Notice of Intent, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the EA. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EA. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

The EA will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the Construction and operation of the proposed project under these general headings:

- geology and soils
- water resources, fisheries, and wetlands
- vegetation and wildlife
- hazardous waste
- land use
- cultural resources
- endangered and threatened species
- public safety

We will also evaluate possible alternatives to the proposed project or portions of the project, and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

Our independent analysis of the issues will be in the EA. Depending on

the comments received during the scoping process, the EA may be published and mailed to Federal, state, and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, affected landowners, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list for this proceeding. A comment period will be allotted for review if the EA is published. We will consider comments on the EA before we make our recommendations to the Commission.

Currently Identified Environmental Issues

We have already identified several issues that we think deserve attention based on a preliminary review of the proposed facilities and the environmental information provided by Northern. This preliminary list of issues may be changed based on your comments and our analysis.

- The productivity of a total of about 139 acres of agricultural land (including 78 acres of prime farmland soils) could be diminished due to the potential impacts of pipeline construction such as rutting and compaction.
- Agricultural drain tiles, if present, could be damaged.

Public Participation

You can make a difference by sending a letter addressing your specific comments or concerns about the project. You should focus on the potential environmental affects of the proposal, alternatives to the proposal (including alternative routes), and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. Please carefully follow these instructions to ensure that your comments are received in time and properly recorded:

- Send two copies of your letter to: David P. Boergers, Acting Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First St., N.E., Room 1A, Washington, DC 20426;
- Label one copy of the comments for the attention of the Environmental Review and Compliance Branch, PR-11.2
- Reference Docket No. CP98-132-000; and
- Mail your comments so that they will be received in Washington, DC on or before March 6, 1998.

If you are interested in obtaining procedural information please write to the Secretary of the Commission.

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, you may want to become an official party to the proceeding or become an "intervenor."

Among other things, intervenors have the right to receive copies of case-related Commission documents and filings by other intervenors. Likewise, each intervenor must provide copies of its filings to all other parties. If you want to become an intervenor you must file a motion to intervene according to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214) (see appendix 2).

The date for filing timely motions to intervene in this proceeding has passed. Therefore, parties now seeking to file late interventions must show good cause, as required by section 385.214(b)(3), why this time limitation should be waived. Environmental issues have been viewed as good cause for late intervention.

You do not need intervenor status to have your environmental comments considered.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-3239 Filed 2-9-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5964-8]

Information Collection Request for the Land Disposal Restrictions Surface Impoundment 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 EPA is planning to submit the following proposed Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). 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 April 13, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Commenters must send an original and two copies of their comments referencing docket number F-98-SIIP-FFFFF to: RCRA Docket Information Center, Office of Solid Waste (5305G), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. Hand deliveries of comments should be made to the Arlington, VA, address below. Comments may also be submitted electronically through the Internet to: rcradocket@epamail.epa.gov. Comments in electronic format should also be

²The appendices reference in this notice are not being printed in the **Federal Register**. Copies are available from the Commission's Public Reference and Files Maintenance Branch, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, or call (202) 208-1317. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail.

identified by the docket number F-98-SIIP-FFFF. All electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption.

Commenters should not submit electronically any confidential business information (CBI). An original and two copies of CBI must be submitted under separate cover to: RCRA CBI Document Control Officer, Office of Solid Waste (5305W), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20460.

Public comments and supporting materials are available for viewing in the RCRA Information Center (RIC), located at Crystal Gateway I, First Floor, 1235 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA. The RIC is open from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding federal holidays. To review docket materials, it is recommended that the public make an appointment by calling (703) 603-9230. The public may copy a maximum of 100 pages from any regulatory docket at no charge. Additional copies cost \$0.15/page. The index and some supporting materials are available electronically.

The ICR is available on the Internet. Follow these instructions to access the information electronically:

On the World Wide Web: [http://](http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/osw/laws-reg.htm#ldr)

www.epa.gov/epaoswer/osw/laws-reg.htm#ldr

On FTP:

[ftp.epa.gov](ftp://ftp.epa.gov)

Login: anonymous

Password: your Internet address

Files are located in /pub/epaoswer

The official record for this action will be kept in paper form. Accordingly, EPA will transfer all comments received electronically into paper form and place them in the official record, which will also include all comments submitted directly in writing.

EPA responses to comments, whether the comments are written or electronic, will be in a background document to a notice in the **Federal Register**. EPA will not immediately reply to commenters electronically other than to seek clarification of electronic comments that may be garbled in transmission or during conversion to paper form, as discussed above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information, contact the RCRA Hotline at 1-800-424-9346 or TDD 1-800-553-7672 (hearing impaired). In the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, call (703) 412-9810 or TDD (703) 412-3323. For more detailed information on specific aspects of this information collection, contact Peggy Vyas, Office of Solid Waste (5302W), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20460,

telephone: (703) 308-5477, E-mail:

vyas.peggy@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act (LDPFA) of 1996 requires EPA to conduct a study characterizing risks to human health and the environment associated with management of decharacterized wastes¹ in impoundments that are part of Clean Water Act treatment systems. On July 25, 1996, EPA published a notice requesting draft methodologies that would reflect the conceptual design and objectives of the study, including the best method to collect data, data quality assurance/quality control, risk assessment, and peer review (see 61 FR 38684, July 25, 1996). EPA concurrently developed its own draft methodology, which the Agency intended to compare with draft methodologies received from commenters. EPA received eight public comments in response to the July 25, 1996 notice; six were fairly general and two were quite detailed. EPA used many of the comments in developing the methodology for this study. This methodology is described in detail in the background document for this notice, entitled "Background and Response to Comments Document: Surface Impoundment Study," available in the RCRA docket.

Two commenters stated that existing data are inadequate to conduct this study and that additional data would need to be collected. The Chemical Manufacturers Association (CMA) commented that "The study cannot be completed with existing data. * * * CMA is willing to assist in ensuring that current and usable data is collected." Union Carbide stated that "The survey should focus on collecting * * * site-specific information and supplementing it, as-needed [sic], with appropriate site-specific modeling. * * * Union Carbide understands and accepts that a survey using a case-by-case approach will may [sic] require more work and expense for owners and operators of surface impoundments than a generic national model would. We think the extra value is worth the extra work: regulatory agencies and the public need to understand real risks and actual regulatory circumstances rather than hypothetical cases."

EPA has chosen to design and implement a study that is consistent with these comments: a study which

¹ Decharacterized wastes are formerly characteristic wastes (wastes for which the hazardous characteristic of ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, or toxicity has been removed).

characterizes risks at a representative sample of actual sites located across the country. To do so, we must first administer a "screener" survey to a representative sample of facilities, in order to locate those with surface impoundments that are within the study's scope. Then, for those facilities with surface impoundments within the study's scope, we would need to collect current, site-specific information from data sources in the public domain, and also rather detailed information which will be available only from the facility owners/operators, in order to perform the site-specific modeling suggested by these commenters. Thus, EPA expects to mail out the screener survey to approximately 1500 facilities to determine if they actually have surface impoundments that fall within the scope of the study. Upon identifying 415 facilities that respond positively to the screener questionnaire, EPA will then send those 415 facilities the more detailed information-gathering questionnaire.

An important note is that EPA has decided to expand the study's scope beyond that which was mandated in the original legislation. Although the LDPFA only requires EPA to study decharacterized nonhazardous wastes, EPA believes it would be necessary to study the risks from surface impoundments managing non-decharacterized nonhazardous wastes as well, to provide comparison with a group of waste management units that are regulated in a similar manner. In addition, as a result of the re-negotiation of a consent decree between EPA and the Environmental Defense Fund (*EDF v. Reilly*, Cir. No. 89-0598, D.D.C.), EPA has now committed to studying the risks associated with air emissions from nonhazardous wastes managed in surface impoundments. That study is to be completed by March 26, 2001.

On April 30, 1997, EPA presented a proposed study methodology to a special subcommittee of the EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB)'s Environmental Engineering Committee. The purpose was to obtain peer review on: (1) the technical merits of the overall study structure; (2) the technical merits of the proposed risk assessment; and (3) use of technical experts/peer review. On May 1, 1997, the subcommittee gave EPA verbal feedback on the proposed approach. The written report from the subcommittee's peer review is expected to be available in 1998.

CMA expressed interest in assisting EPA with the study's implementation, and requested the opportunity to review and comment on the information-gathering questionnaire. After revising

the information-gathering questionnaire to reflect CMA's comments, EPA used this revised questionnaire in a pilot study, and received both comments and burden estimates from the seven facilities² that participated in the pilot study. EPA revised the information-gathering questionnaire again, upon completion of the pilot study. Both the screener questionnaire and the information-gathering questionnaire are part of the background document for this notice.

The proposed risk modeling framework, described in "Technical Memorandum—Proposed Risk Assessment Modeling Framework for the Surface Impoundment Study," is available in the RCRA docket for this notice. The model used in the pilot study, described in "Technical Memorandum—Modifications to the Pilot Study Model for the Surface Impoundment Study," is available in the RCRA docket for this notice.

The Agency also conducted a sensitivity analysis on the proposed risk modeling framework. The sensitivity analysis identifies the "risk-driving variables" and their relative importance in the model outputs. Copies of the sensitivity analysis, entitled "Technical Memorandum—Preliminary Sensitivity Analyses for the Surface Impoundment Study," are available in the RCRA docket for this notice.

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.

II. Burden Statement

EPA estimates each respondent will take 4 hours to respond to the screener questionnaire, at a cost of \$193 per respondent. The total hour burden of the screener questionnaire is estimated to be 6000 hours. The total cost of the screener questionnaire is estimated to be \$288,750. EPA estimates each respondent will take 89.5 hours to respond to the information-gathering questionnaire, at a cost of \$4415 per respondent. The total hour burden of the information-gathering questionnaire is estimated to be 37,142.5 hours. The total cost of the information-gathering questionnaire is estimated to be \$1,832,225.

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.

III. Request for Comment

The EPA solicits comments on:

(i) 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) 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) the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) how to 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 information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Dated: February 3, 1998.

Elizabeth Cotsworth,

Acting Director Office of Solid Waste.

[FR Doc. 98-3324 Filed 2-9-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5964-4]

Ambient Air Monitoring Reference and Equivalent Methods; Receipt of Applications for Reference and Equivalent Method Determinations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of applications.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is announcing that it has received applications from Rupprecht and Patashnick Company, Incorporated, Thermo Environmental Instruments,

Incorporated, BGI, Incorporated, and Graseby Andersen for reference method determinations for their respective PM_{2.5} particle samplers, and from Dasibi Environmental Corporation for an equivalent method determination for their Model 1108 Ozone Analyzer.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Frank F. McElroy, Human Exposure and Atmospheric Sciences Division (MD-46), National Exposure Research Laboratory, U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, (919) 541-2622.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is given that EPA has received applications to determine if six new PM_{2.5} monitoring methods and a new continuous ozone analyzer method should be designated by the Administrator of the EPA as reference or equivalent methods under 40 CFR PART 53. Two applications were received on October 7, 1997 from Rupprecht and Patashnick Company, Incorporated, 25 Corporate Circle, Albany, New York 12203 for that Company's Partisol®-FRM Model 2000 (single) and Partisol®-FRM Model 2025 (sequential) PM-2.5 Air Samplers. An application was received on October 8, 1997 from Thermo Environmental Instruments, Incorporated, 8 West Forge Parkway, Franklin, Massachusetts 02038 regarding its Model 605/FH95-E Computer Assisted Particle Sampler for PM_{2.5}. Another application was received, also on October 8, 1997, from BGI, Incorporated, 58 Guinan Street, Waltham, Massachusetts 02154 for BGI's Model PQ-200 PM2.5 Ambient Fine Particle Sampler. And an application was received on January 8, 1998 from Graseby Andersen, 500 Technology Court, Smyrna, Georgia 30082 for that Company's Models RAAS2.5-100 (single) and RAAS2.5-300 (sequential) PM_{2.5} Samplers. Finally, an application was received on December 4, 1997 from Dasibi Environmental Corporation, 506 Paula Avenue, Glendale, California 91201 for Dasibi's Model 1108 Ozone Analyzer. If, after appropriate technical study, the Administrator determines that any or all of these methods should be designated as reference or equivalent methods, as appropriate, notice thereof will be published in a subsequent issue of the **Federal Register**.

Henry L. Longest II,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc. 98-3321 Filed 2-9-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

² Of the nine facilities (four CMA volunteers, one American Forest and Paper Association volunteer, and four non-volunteers) that were sent pilot questionnaires, seven responded.