abandonment of the Locust Creek delivery meter station.

Specifically, Texas Gas proposes to remove two 4-inch meter runs and related piping, meter building and flow measurement equipment, at an estimated removal cost of $11,000.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–5778 Filed 3–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5974–8]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3051 *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: National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, OMB No. 2050–0096, expiring 4/30/98. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden and cost; where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instruments.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before April 6, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact Sandy Farmer at EPA by phone at (202) 260–2740, by E-mail at farmer.sandy@epamail.epa.gov, or download off the Internet at http://www.epa.gov/icr and refer to EPAC ICR No. 1463.04.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (OMB Control No. 2050–0096; EPA ICR No. 1463.04) expiring 4/30/98. This request seeks extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA or Superfund; 42 U.S.C. 9601 *et seq.*) as amended, establishes broad authority to undertake removal and remedial actions in response to releases or threats of releases of hazardous substances and certain pollutants and contaminants into the environment. The NCP sets forth requirements for carrying out the response authorities established under CERCLA. In addition, the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 requires EPA to determine and report to Congress on its effectiveness, including community involvement activities.

For states, this ICR addresses the record keeping and reporting provisions of the NCP that affect those states that voluntarily participate in the remedial phase of the Superfund program. Remedial responses under the Superfund program fall into the pre-remedial phase (during which the extent of site contamination is assessed) and the remedial phase (during which investigations are conducted to identify and characterize contaminants present and to determine viable remedies for a site, the remedy is chosen and the cleanup or construction is completed). The NCP includes the following reporting and record keeping provisions for the remedial phase of the Superfund program:

(1) States that voluntarily take the lead in remedial activities at Superfund sites must conduct the activities in a manner consistent with CERCLA (40 CFR 300.515(a)). Therefore, at a state-led site, the state must: develop a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS); prepare a Proposed Plan; issue a Record of Decision (ROD); complete community interviews; prepare a Community Involvement Plan (CIP), and provide information to the public; and

(2) States must identify and communicate potential state applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) at all Superfund sites within the state (40 CFR 300.400(g)).

In addition, this ICR addresses the record keeping and reporting provisions of the NCP that affect communities voluntarily providing their concerns to the lead agency about the Superfund process. This ICR also addresses the record keeping and reporting provisions imposed on communities when those communities provide feedback on community involvement activities tied to GPRA. Community involvement related to NCP requirements and GPRA reporting may occur during all phases of the Superfund process including, pre-remedial, remedial removal (short-term response actions), and operation and maintenance (which may include such activities as ground water and air monitoring, inspection and maintenance of the treatment equipment remaining on site, and maintenance of any security measures or institutional controls) Specifically, members of the community surrounding a Superfund site may participate in community interviews (40 CFR 300.23(c)) conducted by EPA in order to prepare a CIP or serve on Technical Assistance Grant groups, as provided for in Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986, as well as in Community Advisory Groups (CAG), as provided for in the Superfund Administrative Reforms. Community groups focused on the technical assistance provided through the Technical Outreach Services for communities (TOSC) program may also participate.

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 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) which solicited comments on this collection of information was published on December 1, 1997; no comments were received.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and record keeping burden for a state agency for this collection of information is estimated to average 1108 hours per response. The annual public reporting and record keeping burden for a community group for this collection of information is estimated to average 33 hours 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.

Respondents/Affected Entities: State environmental agency and community groups.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 806.

Frequency of Response: As required.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 113,490 hours.

Estimated Total Annualized Cost Burden: 0.

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 techniques to the following addresses. Please refer to EPA ICR No. 1463.04 and OMB Control No. 2050–0096 in any correspondence.

Ms. Sandy Farmer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, OPPE Regulatory Information Division (2137), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460.

and

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 25 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: March 2, 1998.

Joseph Retzer, Director,

Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 98–5853 Filed 3–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5489–6]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared February 16, 1998 Through February 20, 1998 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, 1998 (62 FR 16154).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–L61216–WA Rating LO, White Pass Ski Area Expansion, Special-Use-Permit, Pigtail Basin and Hogback Basin, Wenatchee and Gifford, Pinchot National Forests, Yakima and Lewis Counties, WA.

Summary: EPA Region 10 used a screening tool to conduct a limited review of the White Pass Ski Area. Based upon the screen, EPA does not foresee having any environmental objections to the proposed project. Therefore, EPA will not be conducting a detailed review.

ERP No. D–FAA–B51025–NH Rating EC2, Manchester (New Hampshire) Airport Master Plan Update, Improvements to Airside and Landside Facilities, Airport Layout Plan, Permits and Approvals, Manchester, NH.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding wetland and air quality impact. EPA requested additional wetland mitigation and air conformity analysis.

ERP No. D–FHW–L40203–AK Rating EO2, Juneau Access Transportation Project, Improvements in the Lynn Canal/Taiya Inlet Corridor between Juneau and Haines/Skagway, Special-Use-Permit and COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Tongass National Forest, Klondike Gold Rush National Historic Park, Haines State Forest, City and Borough of Juneau, Haines Borough, Cities Haines and Skagway, AK.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections to the East Lynn Canal Highway alternative due to potentially significant impacts to Berners Bay, an area containing high resource and recreational values. EPA also identified the need for additional cumulative/indirect induced impact analyses, further discussion and analyses of project economics, and numerous technical analyses be conducted and presented in the final EIS.

ERP No. D–FTA–J40143–UT Rating EC2, University-Downtown-Airport Transportation Corridor, Major Investment Study, Construction and Operation of the East-West Corridor Light Rail Transit (LRT), Transportation System Management (TSM) and Central Business District (CBD), Funding, Salt Lake County, UT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding air quality and construction impact and requested that these issues be clarified in the Final EIS.

ERP No. D–USA–J11014–CO Rating LO, United States Army Garrison, Fitzsimons (Formerly Fitzsimons Army Medical Center) Disposal and Reuse for BRAC–95, Implementation, City of Aurora, Denver County, CO.

Summary: EPA had no objections to the action as proposed.

ERP No. D–USN–E11041–00 Rating EC2, Cecil Field Naval Air Station, Realignment of F/A–18 Aircraft and Operational Functions, to Other East Coast Installations; NAS Oceana, VA; MCAS Beaufort, SC and MCAS Cherry Point, NC, Implementation, COE Section 404 Permit, FL, SC, NC and VA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concern regarding the noise, transportation, air and water quality, environmental contamination, and terrestrial environmental impacts associated with proposed realignment.

ERP No. D–USN–K11084–CA Rating EC2, Miramar Naval Air Station Realignment of E–2 Aircraft Squadrons, Three Installations are consider: Point Muga Naval Air Weapons Station, Lemoore Naval Air Station and El Centro, Ventura, Fresno, King and Imperial Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA requested additional information on project description, biological resources, and land use noise compatibility. In particular, EPA is concerned by the analysis of the no action alternative.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–FRC–L05207–WA Nooksack River Basin Hydroelectric Projects, Seven Projects—(FERC No. 4628) (FERC No. 4738) (FERC No. 4270) (FERC No. 4282) (FERC No. 9231) (FERC No. 4312) and (FERC No. 3721) Construction and Operation, Licensing, Whatcom County, WA.

Summary: EPA Region 10 used a screening tool to conduct a limited review of this action. Based upon the screen, EPA does not foresee having any environmental objections to the proposed project. Therefore, EPA will not be conducting a detailed review.

ERP No. F–GSA–J81009–CO Denver Federal Center Master Site Plan, implementation, City of Lakewood, Jefferson County, CO.

Summary: EPA continues to have concern regarding this project and its relationship to the RCRA Consent Decree. In addition EPA believes additional information on groundwater sites and impacts to those sites should have been provided.

ERP No. F–IBR–K64016–CA Hamilton City Pumping Plant, Fish Screen Improvement Project, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Central Valley, Butte, Colusa, Glenn and Tehama Counties, CA.

Summary: Review of the Final EIS was not deemed necessary. No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. F–AF–J11012–00 Colorado Airspace Initiative, Modifications to the National Airspace System, such as the