Intent To Award a Grant to the Underground Injection Practices Research Foundation

AGENCY: U.S. Department of Energy, Metairie Site Office.

ACTION: Notice of non-competitive financial assistance (grant).

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE), Metairie Site Office announces that it intends to make a Non-Competitive Financial Assistance Award (Grant) through the Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center to the Underground Injection Practices Research Foundation (UIPRF) of the Ground Water Protection Council (UIPRF). The action is necessary to continue work related to Class II injection well operations in various states throughout the country. The effort will continue implementation of a Risk-Based Data Management System (RBDMS), conduct Class II injection well Area of Review (AOR) workshops, and conduct a RBDMS workshop.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. Department of Energy, Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center, Acquisition and Assistance Division, P.O. Box 10940, MS 921–143, Pittsburgh, PA 15236, Attn.: Eric T. Bell, Telephone: (412) 892–5802

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The UIPRF has proposed a three-task project relating to Class II injection well operations in various states throughout the country. Task I of the proposed project is designed to continue implementation of a Risk-Based Data Management System (RBDMS). Task 2 of this project is designed to develop and conduct workshops using the guideline document developed by an UIPRF committee. These workshops will be held in various locations to further assist the regulator and industry in establishing Area of Review (AOR) variance programs across the country. Task 3 of this project involves one workshop on the RBDMS.

The Underground Injection Practices Council (UIPC) was formed in 1985 to work with various federal agencies, state underground injection control (UIC) officials, municipal and county officials, representatives of environmental groups, industry, scientists, and others on safe and effective methods for waste disposal. The UIPC, through its Research Foundation, conducts a comprehensive program of original research and data collection and serves as a clearinghouse for information on underground injection. The UIPC also conducts a variety of educational programs and serves as a forum for the development of more sound regulations and technical standards.

Greater emphasis is currently being placed on the ability of states to justify their regulatory decisions, with interest in developing reliable procedures for assessing the risks posed by oil and gas injection wells increasing rapidly. Under the Safe Drinking Water Act, agencies that implement UIC programs are required to prevent subsurface injection that endangers an underground source of drinking water (USDW).

In 1993 the UIPRF completed a grant from DOE that involved the investigation of state environmental, oil, and gas data, and data management systems that pertain to underground injection control. The primary goal of this research was to increase the base of technical and environmental knowledge related to the application of the UIPRF model that has been developed to assess the risk of injection water contaminating a USDW. The project involved four major tasks: (1) conducting an inventory and needs assessment of the database management systems of the 21 states that have primacy to supplement the UIC requirements for Class II wells, (2) conducting investigations of six state's data management system capabilities and making hardware and software improvements, (3) conducting a Technical Symposium on Class II injection wells relating to the application of the UIPRF model that was developed to assess risk of injection water contaminating USDWs, and (4) conducting investigations of four states' data management system capabilities and making hardware and software improvements.

In 1994 the UIPRF initiated a two-task DOE-funded project. Task 1 of the project was designed to extend the implementation of a Risk-Based Data Management System (RBDMS) in four states. Alaska, Mississippi, Montana, and Nevada were given assistance with converting data from existing data management systems; coding and internal testing of the RBDMS; preparing documentation, training, and technology transfer; and project management. Task 2 of the project offered assistance in conducting four regional workshops related to Area of Review (AOR) investigations and environmental compliance.

In accordance with 10 CFR 600.7(b)(2)(i) criteria (A) and (D), a noncompetitive Financial Assistance Award to the UIPRF is justified. This effort is a continuation of the two previous mentioned grants. Competing this action would have a significant adverse effect on continuity of the on-going program. The Applicant has exclusive domestic capability to perform this activity successfully, based upon the unique technical expertise of the UIPRF which will ensure maximum utilization of existing state, federal, industry, and commercial sources of data necessary to complete the study. This effort therefore is considered suitable for noncompetitive financial assistance. A competitive solicitation would be inappropriate.

DOE funding for this research is estimated to be $1,070,000 for the 24 month duration of the project. These funds will be used to pay for the cost of research staff, administrative support personnel, consultants, experts, and printing costs as necessary for the research project.

Issued in Pittsburgh, PA, on August 31, 1995.

Richard D. Rogus,

Contracting Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–22627 Filed 9–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Energy Information Administration

Proposed Revision and Extension of Coal Data Collections

AGENCY: Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of the proposed revision and extension of coal data collections and solicitation of comments.

SUMMARY: The Energy Information Administration (EIA) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed revision and extension of the coal data collections included in the Coal Program Package. The following surveys are covered by this action: Form EIA–1, ''Weekly Coal Monitoring Report—General Industries and Blast Furnaces,'' (Standby), Form EIA–3, ''Quarterly Coal Consumption Report—Manufacturing Plants,'' Form EIA–3A, ''Annual Coal Quality Report—Manufacturing Plants,'' Form EIA–4, ''Weekly Coal Monitoring Report—Coke Plants,'' (Standby), Form EIA–5, ''Coke Plant Report—Quarterly,'' Form EIA–5A, ''Annual Coal Quality Report—Coke Plants,'' Form EIA–6, ''Coal Distribution Report,'' Form EIA–7A, ''Coal Production Report,'' and Form EIA–20, ''Weekly Telephone Survey of Coal Burning Utilities,'' (Standby).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before November 13, 1995. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should

advise the contact listed below of your intention to do so as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Thomas Murphy, Coal Data Systems Branch, EI-521, Forrestal Building, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C. 20585. Alternatively, Mr. Murphy can be reached at TMURPHY@EIA.DOE.GOV (Internet e-mail), 202–254–5561 (voice), or 202–254–6233 (facsimile).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the forms and instructions should be directed to Thomas Murphy at the address listed above.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background
II. Current Actions
III. Request for Comments

I. Background

In order to fulfill its responsibilities under the Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974 (Pub. L. No. 93–275) and the Department of Energy Organization Act (Pub. L. No. 95–91), the Energy Information Administration is obliged to carry out a central, comprehensive, and unified energy data and information program. As part of this program, EIA collects, evaluates, assembles, analyzes, and disseminates data and information related to energy resource reserves, production, demand, and technology, and related economic and statistical information relevant to the adequacy of energy resources to meet demands in the near and longer term future for the Nation's economic and social needs.

The Energy Information Administration, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden (required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13)), conducts a presurvey consultation program to provide the general public and other Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing reporting forms. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden is minimized, reporting forms are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed.

The coal surveys included in the Coal Program Package collect information on coal production, distribution, receipts, consumption, quality, stocks, and prices. Data are used to support public policy analyses of the coal industry and are published in various EIA publications. Respondents to the surveys include coal producers, coal distributors, and coal consumers.

The EIA is attempting to employ electronic data collection methods in order to better serve those customers that have or intend to have FAX, Internet, and other electronic reporting capabilities for use in submitting their data to the EIA. If you are a coal survey respondent, please respond to questions E and I at the end of this notice so that we can better serve you in the future.

II. Current Actions

Based upon an internal review of coal program data requirements and consultations with the coal industry and data users we propose to implement one of the following two options with respect to the surveys in the Coal Program Package. Our objective in proposing these options is to modify the EIA coal data program by reducing respondent reporting burden and survey operating costs, without degrading the accuracy and coverage of the EIA's coal data.

Option 1

EIA–6

This option proposes to reduce the frequency of the current survey from quarterly to annual. Quarterly estimates of State-level coal consumption in the ''Other Industrial'' and ''Residential and Commercial Sectors'' would be made by EIA.

This option would also fill the resulting data gap of quarterly production and producer stocks by using Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) quarterly coal production and producer stock data so that no quarterly coal production or stock data would be collected by EIA. The use of MSHA quarterly data has been discussed with MSHA. MSHA plans to collect producer stock data for EIA on their quarterly survey Form 7000–2, ''Quarterly Mine, Employment and Coal Production Report.'' Quarterly distributor stock data would be estimated at the State-level by EIA.

EIA–3

This option would delete the requirement for disaggregation by coal rank (anthracite, bituminous, subbituminous, and lignite) and replace it with a check-off box to indicate the predominant rank of coal receipts.

In Part III of this survey, we propose to delete the question relating to the share of electricity sold to electric utilities and rely on the EIA–867 for this information.

EIA–5

This option would delete the requirement for disaggregation of all coal data by coal rank. Additionally, a column would be added to Part III of the current form to clarify reporting for intra-company transfers of coke.

EIA–3A/EIA–5A

We propose to reduce the frequency of these surveys from annual to triennial.

EIA–7A

Since the reporting requirements for this survey can vary significantly, depending upon the type of respondent (mine only, preparation plant only, and mine collocated with a preparation plant), we propose to have a common identification page and split the remainder of this survey into three separate schedules, each of which will be tailored to suit the type of respondent.

In addition, we propose to eliminate the collection of certain identification information and employment data, relying instead on MSHA data on Form 7000–2.

EIA–1/EIA–4/EIA–20

We propose to request that these forms be re-cleared without changes.

Option 1 Burden Impact

The annual respondent burden for the current coal forms is 19,380 hours. The EIA estimates that Option 1 would reduce the annual respondent burden to 8,437 hours, a decrease of 10,943 hours (56 percent).

Option 2

EIA–6

This option would eliminate the EIA–6 survey entirely. To partially fill the resulting data gap for distribution to consumer sectors by origin and destination State, we propose to add origin State for receipts on the quarterly EIA–3 survey (manufacturing plants) and the quarterly EIA–5 survey (coke plants). The FERC Form 423 currently collects coal receipts data by origin for electric utility plants having a capacity of 50MW or more. Thus the origin and destination of coal going to most of the consuming sectors would be maintained. All methods of transportation data would be eliminated. Some of these data are available from outside sources, such as Resource Data International, Association of American Railroads, and the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

This option also eliminates State-level data covering coal distribution to the agriculture, mining and construction sectors (currently 0.2 percent of total annual domestic distribution) and distribution data for the ''Residential'' and Commercial sectors (currently 0.6

percent of total annual domestic distribution). Some of the data for the agriculture, mining, and construction industries, as well as the residential and commercial sectors can be captured on the annual Form EIA–867, to the extent that coal consumption in these sectors is attributable to coal-fired generators larger than 1 MW. Quarterly estimates of national-level consumption in the agriculture, mining, construction, and residential and commercial sectors would be made by the EIA.

This option would fill the resulting data gap of quarterly production and producer stocks data by using Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) quarterly coal production and producer stock data so that no quarterly coal production or stock data would be collected by EIA. MSHA plans to collect producer stock data for EIA on their quarterly survey Form 7000–2, ''Quarterly Mine Employment and Coal Production Report.'' Distributor stock data would be estimated by the EIA at the National level.

EIA–3

This option would add State of origin of coal receipts data to the EIA–3 to fill one of the data gaps from elimination of the EIA–6. Coal consumption, cost, adjustments, and coal stocks (Columns B, D, E, F, and G of the current form) would be reported in the aggregate only. We propose to delete the requirement for disaggregation by coal rank (anthracite, bituminous, subbituminous, and lignite) and replace it with a check-off box to indicate the predominant rank of coal receipts.

In Part III of this survey, we propose to delete the question relating to the share of electricity sold to electric utilities and rely on the EIA–867 for this information.

EIA–5

This option would add State of origin of coal receipts to the EIA–5 to fill another of the data gaps from elimination of the EIA–6. Coal consumption, cost, adjustments, and coal stocks (Columns B, E, F, and G of the current form) would be reported in the aggregate only. We propose to delete the requirement for disaggregation of all coal data by coal rank. Additionally, a column would be added to Part III of the current form to clarify reporting for intra-company transfers of coke.

EIA–3A/EIA–5A

We propose to reduce the frequency of these surveys from annual to triennial.

EIA–7A

Since the reporting requirements for this survey can vary significantly, depending upon the type of respondent (mine only, preparation plant only, and mine collocated with preparation plant), we propose to have a common identification page and split the remainder of this survey into three separate schedules, each of which will be tailored to the type of respondent.

In addition, we propose to eliminate the collection of certain identification information and employment data, relying instead on MSHA data on Form 7000–2 for this information.

EIA–1/EIA–4/EIA–20

These are standby forms that would be used to monitor coal receipts, coal consumption, and coal stocks at major coal-burning facilities in the event of a coal supply disruption. We propose to request that these forms be re-cleared without changes.

Option 2 Burden Impact

The annual respondent burden for the current coal forms is 19,380 hours. The EIA estimates that Option 2 would reduce the annual respondent burden to 4,147 hours, a decrease of 15,233 hours (79 percent).

III. Request for Comments

Prospective respondents and other interested parties should comment on the actions (Options 1 and 2) discussed in item II. Comments are also invited, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act, on the coal data collections, EIA–1, 3, 3A, 4, 5, 5A, 6, and 7A. The following guidelines are provided to assist in the preparation of your responses. When commenting on specific form(s), please indicate to which form(s) your comments apply.

General Issues

EIA is interested in receiving comments from persons regarding:

A. 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. Practical utility is the actual usefulness of information to or for an agency, taking into account its accuracy, adequacy, reliability, timeliness, and the agency's ability to process the information it collects.

B. What enhancements can EIA make to the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

As a Potential Respondent

C. Are the instructions and definitions clear and sufficient? If not, which instructions require clarification?

D. Can data be submitted in accordance with the due date specified in the instructions?

E. Public reporting burden hours per response for both options in this collection are detailed below.

Form	Option 1	Option 2
EIA–1	1.0	1.0
EIA–3	.4	.8
EIA–3A	.33	.33
EIA–4	1.0	1.0
EIA–5	.9	1.4
EIA–5A	.33	.33
EIA–6	5.0	0
EIA–7A	.5	.5
EIA–20	1.0	1.0

Burden includes the total time, effort, or financial resources expended to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide the information including: (1) Reviewing instructions; (2) developing, acquiring, installing, and utilizing technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, verifying, processing, maintaining, disclosing and providing information; (3) adjusting the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; (4) training personnel to respond to a collection of information; (5) searching data sources; (6) completing and reviewing the collection of information; and (7) transmitting, or otherwise disclosing the information.

Please comment on (1) the accuracy of our estimate, and (2) how the agency could minimize the burden of the collection of information, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

F. What is the estimated cost of completing the form(s), including the direct and indirect costs associated with the data collection? Direct costs should include all costs, such as administrative costs, directly attributable to providing this information.

G. Do you know of any other Federal, State, or local agency that collects similar data? If you do, specify the agency, the data element(s), and the methods of collection.

H. Which option do you prefer and why (Option 1 or Option 2)?

I. If you have the capability, what is your electronic reporting preference (FAX, Touch-Tone Telephone Data Entry, Internet, etc.)?

As a Potential User

J. Can you use data at the levels of detail indicated on the form(s)?

K. For what purpose would you use the data? Be specific.

L. Are there alternate sources of data and do you use them? If so, what are their deficiencies and/or strengths?

M. For the most part, coal data is published by EIA in short tons of coal. Would you prefer to see EIA publish more data in metric tons? If yes, please specify what information (e.g., coal production, coal consumption) and in which EIA publication(s) you would like to see such information.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of the form(s). They also will become a matter of public record.

Statutory Authority: Section 3506 (c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. No. 104–13).

Issued in Washington, DC, September 6, 1995.

John Gross,

Acting Director, Office of Statistical Standards, Energy Information Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–22629 Filed 9–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project Nos. 432–022, et al.]

Hydroelectric Applications, Carolina Light and Power Company, et al.; Notice of Applications

Take notice that the following hydroelectric applications have been filed with the Commission and are available for public inspection:

1 a. *Type of Application:* Whitewater Recreation Management and Site Development Plan.

b. *Project No.:* 432–022.

c. *Date Filed:* August 1, 1995.

d. *Applicant:* Carolina Power and Light Company.

e. *Name of Project:* Walters.

f. *Location:* Pigeon River, Haywood County, North Carolina.

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

h. *Applicant Contact:* R.M. Coats, Manager, Carolina Power and Light Company, P.O. Box 1551, Raleigh, NC 27602, (919) 546–6031.

i. *FERC Contact:* Patti Pakkala, (202) 219–0025.

j. *Comment Date:* October 19, 1995.

k. *Description of Project:* Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L), licensee for the Walters Project, requests approval of a whitewater recreation management and site development plan. As part of this plan, CP&L requests approval for developing a whitewater rafting staging area and launch ramps directly downstream of the Walters Project powerhouse, on the Pigeon River. The ramps and staging area are to be available to both public boaters and commercial rafting companies. The plan also establishes management guidelines for the recreational use of the river.

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

2 a. *Type of Application:* Amendment to Recreation Plan.

b. *Project No.:* 2685–003.

c. *Date Filed:* June 30, 1995.

d. *Applicant:* New York Power Authority.

e. *Name of Project:* Blenheim-Gilboa.

f. *Location:* Schoharie Creek, Schoharie County, New York.

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

h. *Applicant Contact:* Mr. Charles Lipsky, New York Power Authority,123 Main Street, White Plains, NY 10601, (914) 681–6200.

i. *FERC Contact:* Patti Pakkala, (202) 219–0025.

j. *Comment Date:* October 19, 1995.

k. *Description of Project:* New York Power Authority (Authority), licensee for the Blenheim-Gilboa Project, requests approval of an amendment to the project recreation plan. Specifically, the Authority requests approval of a proposal to implement an archery hunting program on certain project lands. The hunting area would be designated with safety zones and would be jointly administered by the Authority and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

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

3 a. *Type of Application:* Preliminary Permit.

b. *Project No.:* 11553–000.

c. *Date filed:* July 13, 1995.

d. *Applicant:* Lace River Hydro.

e. *Name of Project:* Lace River.

f. *Location:* In Tongass National Forest, at an unnamed lake, on an unnamed tributary of the Lace River, in the Borough of Juneau, Alaska. Township 34S, Range 63E, Sections 33 to 36, Township 35S, Range 63E, Sections 1 to 4, 8, 9, 17 to 19, Township 35S, Range 63E, Section 19 and Township 35S, Range 62E Sections 5, 8, 16, 17, 22 to 24.

g. *Filed Pursuant to:* Federal Power Act 16 USC §§ 791(a)–825(r).

h. *Applicant Contact:* Mr. Earle V. Ausman, 1503 West 33rd Avenue,Anchorage, AK 99503, (907) 258–2420.

i. *FERC Contact:* Michael Spencer at (202) 219–2846.

j. *Comment Date:* November 13, 1995.

k. *Description of Project:* The proposed project would consist of: (1) either a siphon intake or a new 20-foot-high timber buttress dam; (2) the existing unnamed lake has a surface area of 384 acres and 7,600 acre-feet of storage, if the dam is built the surface area would become 420 acres and storage would be 8,400 acre-feet; (3) a 7,600-foot-long, 21-inch-diameter penstock; (4) a powerhouse containing one generating unit with a capacity of 4,900 kW and an average annual generation of 34.1 GWh; and (5) a 5-mile-long transmission line.

No new access road will be needed to conduct the studies. The applicant estimates that the cost of the studies to be conducted under the preliminary permit would be $50,000.

l. *Purpose of Project:* Project power would be sold.

m. This notice also consists of the following standard paragraphs: A5, A7, A9, A10, B, C, and D2.

4 a. *Type of Application:* Surrender of License.

b. *Project No.:* 8133–053.

c. *Date Filed:* July 19, 1995.

d. *Applicant:* B.S. Inc.

e. *Name of Project:* East Fork Ditch Hydropower.

f. *Location:* On the East Fork Weiser River, in Adams County, ID.

g. *Filed Pursuant to:* Federal Power Act, 16 USC Section 791(a)–825(r).

h. *Applicant Contact:* David J. Stecher, B.S. Inc., 8211 Chesterfield Avenue, Boise, ID 83704, (208) 322–2943.

i. *FERC Contact:* Regina Saizan, (202) 219–2673.

j. *Comment Date:* October 19, 1995.

k. *Description of Application:* The licensee seeks to surrender the license for this unconstructed project because it is insolvent and is unable to proceed with construction.

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

Standard Paragraphs

A5. Preliminary Permit—Anyone desiring to file a competing application for preliminary permit for a proposed project must submit the competing application itself, or a notice of intent to file such an application, to the Commission on or before the specified comment date for the particular application (see 18 CFR 4.36). Submission of a timely notice of intent allows an interested person to file the competing preliminary permit application no later than 30 days after the specified comment date for the particular application. A competing