

oxygenate blenders and perform a quality assurance program to assure and verify that appropriate oxygenate blending is taking place.

There are several other areas relating to quality assurance where recordkeeping is voluntary, for defense purposes. Refiners can perform downstream quality assurance to verify quality of branded gasoline downstream. This is not required, but may be necessary to meet the refiner's defense where a violation is found. Oxygenate blenders are also subject to a sampling and testing affirmative defense provision. Terminals, pipelines and distributors also can perform a voluntary sampling program for defense purposes.

Retailers and wholesale purchaser-consumers in RFG areas must maintain transfer documents so EPA can determine that the gasoline complies with requirements for the geographic area and time of year at the location it is dispensed. However, because conventional gasoline compliance is determined at the refinery level, and without time or use restrictions, retailers and wholesale purchaser-consumers in non-RFG areas do not need to maintain product transfer information related to the regulatory program.

All parties that must maintain records under the regulation have a 5 year retention requirement.

The EPA would like to solicit comments to:

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

(iv) 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 technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

**Burden Statement:** Refiner/Importer hours per year per respondent is about 138 for RFG compliance, including voluntary quality assurance programs, and about 27 hours per year per respondent for conventional gasoline compliance, including voluntary quality assurance. There are about 150

respondents for RFG purposes and about 230 for conventional gasoline.

The frequency of response and associated yearly hourly burden for refiners/importers for RFG compliance is as follows: Registration is a one-time requirement that all respondents should have completed; Designate and certify each batch of RFG (100 per year; 1.5 hrs. per yr.); Test each batch of RFG (100 per yr. (largely CBP); 40 hrs. per yr.); Product transfer document for each batch (100 per yr. (largely CBP); 0 hrs.); Contracts with oxygenate blenders (for 10 parties who choose to do this method, frequency is 5 per yr.; 16 hrs. per party); Quality assurance efforts with oxygenate blenders (for the 10 parties who choose this method, 20 samples per yr., 30 hrs. per yr.); Report compliance (4 responses per yr.; EDI ok; 4 hrs. per response (16 hrs. per yr.)); and Compliance audit (one per year; 80 hrs. (See conventional gasoline burden for additional hrs.)).

The frequency of response and associated hourly burden for refiners/importers of conventional gasoline is as follows: Registration (one-time burden already completed); Test gasoline produced (12 responses; 2 hrs. per yr. (See additional cost breakdown below); Batch designations (158 responses per yr.; 1.5 hrs. per year); Product transfer documents (158 per yr.; 0 hrs (largely CBP)); Compliance report (1 per yr.; 3.3 hrs.); and Compliance audit (1 per yr.; 20 hrs.).

Purchase of services costs for refiners and importers (150 respondents) of RFG are as follows: Surveys (industry-wide with cost spread among all refiner/importer respondents; 60 surveys in 1997 and 50 in subsequent years) (\$20,000 per respondent in 1997 and possibly greater than \$30,000 or more per respondent in subsequent years (EPA seeks comment regarding the cost, and the rationale for the cost, of the surveys in 1998 and subsequent years)); RFG batch testing by outside laboratory (\$15,000 per year (beyond CBP)); RFG in-line audits (\$826 per party); RFG independent laboratory testing (\$9,013 per party); and voluntary quality assurance (\$9,000 per party).

Purchase of services costs by refiners/importers of conventional gasoline are as follows: Laboratory testing (\$1,200 per party). There are 230 parties.

Hourly burdens for RFG oxygenate blenders are as follows: Register (1-time burden accomplished by most parties); Quality assurance testing for terminal tank blenders (100 respondents; 18 responses per yr. taking 16 hrs. per yr.); Quality assurance for truck blenders (250 respondents; 12 responses per yr.; 7.9 hrs. per yr.); and Compliance

reporting (350 respondents; 1 per yr.; 3.4 hrs.).

Purchase of services costs for oxygenate blenders: \$450 for lab testing for each of 350 respondents and \$286 for compliance audit for each of 350 parties.

Hourly burdens for RFG distributors: Product transfer documents for truckers (mostly CBP; 0 hrs.; 1,360 responses per yr.; 2,200 respondents); Product transfer documents for terminals (mostly CBP; 0 hrs.; 12,000 responses per yr.; 250 respondents); Terminal quality assurance ((non-oxygenate); 10 responses; 6.5 hrs. per yr.; 250 respondents); Retailer RFG product transfer document requirement ((mostly CBP); 0 hrs.; 45 responses; 75,000 respondents).

Hourly burdens for distributors of conventional gasoline: Product transfer documents for truckers ((mostly CBP); 0 hrs.; 1,360 responses; 5,400 respondents); Product transfer documents for terminals ((mostly CBP); 0 hrs.; 9,000 responses; 880 parties).

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.

Dated: December 6, 1996.

Sylvia K. Lowrance,

*Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator,  
Office of Enforcement and Compliance  
Assurance.*

[FR Doc. 96-32351 Filed 12-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[ER-FRL-5475-9]

#### **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 December 9, 1996 Through December 13, 1996 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

- EIS No. 960566, Draft EIS, COE, LA, Mississippi River—Gulf Outlet (MRGO) New Lock and Connecting Channels Replacement and Construction for Connection to the Mississippi River, Implementation, Orleans and St. Bernard Parishes, LA, Due: February 3, 1997, Contact: Richard Boe (504) 862-1505.
- EIS No. 960567, Final EIS, FHW, FL, Tampa Interstate Project, Funding, I-275 to just north of Cypress Street and I-275 from the Howard Frankland Bridge/Kennedy Boulevard ramps north to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard and I-4 from I-275, Hillsborough County, FL, Due: January 21, 1997, Contact: Mark D. Bartlett (904) 942-9598.
- EIS No. 960568, Draft EIS, COE, OR, Joe Ney and Upper Pony Creek Reservoirs Expansion Project, Municipal Water Supply, COE Section 10 and 404 Permit Issuance, Coos County, OR, Due: February 18, 1997, Contact: David Kurkoski (503) 326-6094.
- EIS No. 960569, Final Supplement, NOA, NC, FL, SC, GA, South Atlantic Region Shrimp Fishery Management Plan, Implementation, Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), NC, SC, FL and GA, Due: January 21, 1997, Contact: Peter Eldridge (813) 570-5305.
- EIS No. 960570, Final EIS, FRC, NV, Blue Diamond South Pumped Storage Hydroelectric (FERC No. 10756) Project, Issuance of License for Construction, Operation and Maintenance, Right-of-Way Grant and Possible COE Section 404 Permit, Clark County, NV, Due: January 21, 1997, Contact: Dianne Rodman (202) 219-2830.
- EIS No. 960571, Draft EIS, UMC, CA, Sewage Effluent Compliance Project, Implementation, Lower Santa Margarita Basin, Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, San Diego County, CA, Due: February 3, 1997, Contact: Sheila Donovan (619) 532-3624.
- EIS No. 960572, Final EIS, FHW, VA, US 58 and Midtown Tunnel Construction, Brambleton Avenue and Hampton Boulevard in Norfolk to US 58 and VA-164/Western Freeway in Portsmouth, Funding, COE Section 404 Permit and CGD Bridge Permit, Elizabeth River, VA, Due: January 21, 1997, Contact: Roberto Fonesca-Martinez (804) 281-5100.
- EIS No. 960573, Final EIS, BLM, NV, Twin Creeks Mine Consolidation and Expansion, which Encompasses the former Rabbit Creek Mine and the former Chimmey Creek Mine, Plan of Operation Approval and Permit Issuance, Winnemucca District, Humboldt County, NV, Due: January 21, 1997, Contact: Gerald Moritz (702) 623-1500.
- EIS No. 960574, Draft Supplement, NOA, Atlantic Coast Weakfish Fishery, Fishery Management Plan, Implementation, Updated Information, Weakfish Harvest Control in the Atlantic Ocean Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), off the New England, Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Coast, Due: February 3, 1997, Contact: Thomas Meyer (301) 713-2339.
- EIS No. 960575, Final EIS, NPS, NM, Petroglyph National Monument, General Management Plan and Development Concept Plan, Implementation, Bernalillo County, NM, Due: January 21, 1997, Contact: Lawrence Beal (505) 899-0205.
- EIS No. 960576, Final EIS, AFS, WA, Huckleberry Land Exchange Consolidate Ownership and Enhance Future Conservation and Management, Federal Land and Non Federal Land, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, Skagit, Snohomish, King, Pierce, Kittitas and Lewis Counties, WA, Due: January 21, 1997, Contact: Doug Schrenk (206) 888-1421.
- EIS No. 960577, Final EIS, DOE, Programmatic EIS—Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action Ground Water Project, Clean up of 24 Mill Sites, Implementation, Due: January 21, 1997, Contact: Donald R. Metzler (970) 248-7612.
- EIS No. 960578, Final EIS, AFS, CA, Humboldt Nursery Pest Management Plan, Implementation, Six Rivers National Forest, McKinleyville, Humboldt County, CA, Due: January 21, 1997, Contact: Susan J. Frankel (415) 705-2651.
- Dated: December 17, 1996.  
B. Katherine Biggs,  
*Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.*  
[FR Doc. 96-32390 Filed 12-19-96; 8:45 am]
- BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**
- 
- [ER-FRL-5476-1]**
- Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments**
- Availability of EPA comments prepared November 25, 1996 Through November 29, 1996 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 5, 1996 (65 FR 15251).
- Draft EISs
- ERP No. D-BLM-K67038-NV Rating EO2, Ruby Hill Gold Mining Operations Project, Implementation, Battle Mountain District, Plan of Operations and COE Section 404 Permit, Eureka County, NV.
- Summary:* EPA expressed environmental objection due to potential accedences of the annual National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for PM10 (particulate matter smaller than 10 microns). EPA also expressed concerns regarding residual impacts to sensitive species and their habitats and facilities design. EPA indicated that if the impacts to air quality and sensitive species can be sufficiently mitigated, the West Waste Rock Dump Alternative appears to be the environmentally preferable alternative, and we would recommend that BLM select it as the preferred alternative.
- ERP No. D-COE-K36108-CA Rating EC2, Santa Rosa Subregional Long-Term Wastewater Project, Implementation, Reclaimed Water Disposal from the Laguna Wastewater Treatment Plant, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Sonoma County, CA.
- Summary:* EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding potential impacts to surface and groundwater quality and potential conversion of sensitive wetland habitats.
- ERP No. D-DOI-J39025-UT Rating EC2, Wastach County Water Efficiency Project and Daniel Replacement Pipeline Project, Implementation, Wastach County, UT.
- Summary:* EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the wetlands analysis and requested that corrected information related to wetland impacts needs to be presented in the final EIS in order to adequately address the differences between the alternatives.
- ERP No. D-URC-J39024-UT Rating EC2, Provo River Restoration Project (PRRP), Riverine Habitat Restoration, Reconstruction and Realignment of the existing Provo River Channel and Floodplain System between Jordanell Dam and Deer River Reservoir, Wasatch County, UT.
- Summary:* EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the analysis of temporal impacts and impacts due to future recreational uses of the project area. EPA requested that these issues be addressed in the final EIS.