and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions and protests should be filed on or before May 29, 1998. Protests will be considered by the Commission to determine the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–13691 Filed 5–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6101–7]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review, Comment Request

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: Superfund Site Evaluation and Hazard Ranking System, OMB Control No. 2050–0005 to expire on July 31, 1998. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected cost and burden; where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instrument.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before June 22, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact Sandy Farmer at EPA by phone (202) 260–2740, by email at farmer.sandy@epamail.epa.gov, or download off the Internet at http://www.epa.gov/icr and refer to EPA ICR No. 1488.04.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Superfund Site Evaluation and Hazard Ranking System, (EPA ICR No. 1488.04, OMB Control No. 2050–0005) expiring July 31, 1998. This ICR requests an extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: Section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, 1980 and 1986) amends the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan (NCP) to include criteria prioritizing releases throughout the U.S. before undertaking remedial action at uncontrolled hazardous waste sites. The Hazard Ranking System (HRS) is a model that is used to evaluate the relative threats to human health and the environment posed by actual or potential releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants. The HRS criteria take into account the population at risk, the hazard potential of the substances, as well as the potential for contamination of drinking water supplies, direct human contact, destruction of sensitive ecosystems, damage to natural resources affecting the human food chain, contamination of surface water used for recreation or potable water consumption, and contamination of ambient air.

Under this ICR the States will apply the HRS by identifying and classifying those releases that warrant further investigation. The HRS score is crucial since it is the primary mechanism used to determine whether a site is eligible to be included on the National Priorities List (NPL). Only sites on the NPL are eligible for Superfund-financed remedial actions.

HRS scores are derived from the sources described in this information collection, including field reconnaissance, taking samples at the site, and reviewing available reports and documents. States record the collected information on HRS documentation worksheets and include this in the supporting reference package. States then send the package to the EPA region for a completeness and accuracy review, and the Region then sends it to EPA Headquarters for a final quality assurance review. If the site scores above the NPL designated cutoff value, and if it meets the other criteria for listing, it is then eligible to be proposed on the NPL.

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** Notice required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on March 4, 1998 (63 FR 10607). Three requests for copies of the ICR were received; however, EPA received no comments.

Burden Statement: Depending on the number and type of activities performed, burden for the collection of site assessment information is estimated to range from 53 to 1,899 hours per site. The number of hours required to assess a particular site depends on how far a site progresses through the site assessment process. Sites where only a pre-CERCLIS screening is performed will typically require approximately 53 hours, while sites that progress to NPL listing will require approximately 1,899 hours. The burden estimates include reporting activities and minimal record keeping activities. The States are reimbursed 100 percent of their costs, except for record maintenance. The ICR does not impose burden for HRS activities on local governments or private businesses. 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: State agencies or Indian Tribes requesting oversight of the site.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 60 States or Indian Tribes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 203,373 hours.

Estimated Total Annualized Cost Burden: 0 (reimbursed by EPA).

Frequency of Response: Periodically/Per SARA Section 116(b).

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. 1488.04 and OMB Control No. 2050–0005 in any correspondence.

Ms. Sandy Farmer,

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,

OPPE Regulatory Information Division (2137),

401 M Street, S.W.,

Washington, DC 20460;

and

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs,

Office of Management and Budget,

Attention: Desk Officer for EPA,

725 17th Street, NW.,

Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: May 18, 1998.

Richard T. Westlund,

Acting Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 98–13786 Filed 5–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5492–1]

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 May 11, 1998 Through May 15, 1998

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 980178, Final EIS, NOA, MA, New Bedford Harbor Environment Restoration Plan, Implementation, Acushnet River, Buzzards Bay, MA, Due: June 22, 1998, Contact: Rolland A. Schmitten (301) 713–2239.

EIS No. 980179, Final EIS, AFS, MT, Meadow Timber Sales, Implementation, Timber Harvesting, Road Construction and Prescribed Burning, Fortine Ranger District, Kootenai National Forest, Lincoln County, MT, Due: June 22, 1998, Contact: Joleen Durham (406) 882–4451.

EIS No. 980180, Draft EIS, FHW, MO, US 60 Highway Project, Improvement from East of Willow Springs to West of Van Buren, Funding, NPDES Permit and COE 404 Permit, Howell, Shannon and Carter Counties, MO, Due: July 6, 1998, Contact: Don Neumann (573) 636–7104.

EIS No. 980181, Final EIS, USA, MD, PA, MD, PA, Fort Ritchie Disposal and Reuse for BRAC of 638 Acres, Implementation, Frederick and Washington Counties, MD and Adams and Franklin Counties, PA, Due: June 22, 1998, Contact: Clifford Kidd (410) 962–3100.

EIS No. 980182, Draft EIS, BLM, CA, Telephone Flat Geothermal Power Plant within the Glass Mountain Known Geothermal Resource Area, Construction, Operation and Decommissioning of a 48 megawatt (MW) Geothermal Plant, Modoc National Forest, Siskiyou County, CA, Due: July 22, 1998, Contact: Randall Sharp (520) 233–8848.

EIS No. 980183, Final Supplement EIS, FHW, NC, Smith Creek Parkway, Updated and Supplemental Information, Construction from Third Street to Kornegay Avenue, U.S. Coast Guard Permit, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Wilmington, Hanover County, NC, Due: June 22, 1998, Contact: Nicholas L. Graf (919) 856–4346.

EIS No. 980184, Final EIS, SCS, NB, KS, Turkey Creek Watershed Plan, Watershed Protection and Flood Protection, Johnson and Pawnee Counties, NB and Marshall and Nemaha Counties, KS, Due: June 22, 1998, Contact: Craig Derickson (402) 437–4112.

EIS No. 980185, Final EIS, BLM, CA, NV, Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing on Public Rangelands in California and Northwestern Nevada, CA and NV, Due: June 22, 1998, Contact: James Morrison (916) 978–4642.

EIS No. 980186, Draft EIS, UAF, ND, Minuteman III Missile System Dismantlement, Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) Launch Facilities (LFs) and Missile Alert Facilities (MAFs), Deployment Areas, Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND, Due: July 6, 1998, Contact: Jonathan D. Farthing (210) 536–3069.

EIS No. 980187, Final EIS, AFS, AK, Chasina Timber Sale, Harvesting Timber and Road Construction, Tongass National Forest, Craig Ranger District, Ketchikan Administrative Area, AK, Due: June 22, 1998, Contact: Norm Matson (907) 228–6273.

EIS No. 980188, Final EIS, COE, NY, Atlantic Coast of Long Island Jones Inlet to East Rockaway Inlet Storm Damage Reduction Project, Construction, Long Beach Island, Nassau County, NY, Due: June 22, 1998, Contact: Steven Sinkevich (212) 264–2198.

EIS No. 980189, Draft Supplement EIS, HI Ma'aLaea Harbor Improvements for Light-Draft-Vessels, Entrance Channel Realignment and Breakwater Modification, Additional Information, Island of Maui, Maui County, HI, Due: July 6, 1998, Contact: Benton Ching (808) 438–1157.

Dated: May 19, 1998.

Anne Norton Miller,

Deputy Director, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 98–13779 Filed 5–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5492–2]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared May 4, 1998 Through May 8, 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 10, 1998 (63 FR 17856).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–B61023–NH

Rating EC2, Waterville Valley Ski Resort Project, Development of Snowmaking Water Impoundments Project, Special-Use-Permits, Dredge and Fill Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, White Mountain National Forest, Pemigewasset Ranger District, Town of Waterville Valley, Grafton County, NH.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns and suggested that the impact to water quality from alternatives two and four be further developed in the FEIS. EPA recommended mitigation option two to offset unavoidable wetland impacts associated with the project.

ERP No. D–COE–K32050–CA

Rating EO2, Oakland Harbor Inner and Outer Deep Navigation (–50 Foot) Improvement Project, Implementation, Feasibility Study, Port of Oakland, Alameda and San Francisco Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections due to potential air quality impacts, especially emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NOx) associated with dredging, dredged material transport/disposal and related construction work. Despite these significant NOx emissions, there is no indication from the DEIS that NOx mitigation measures proposed by the Corps would suffice for purposes of making a positive conformity finding. EPA expressed serious concerns that the EIS may have unnecessarily constrained the range of reasonable action alternatives by eliminating a detailed analysis of dredge depths less than –50 feet. EPA asked the Corps to determine