Greatest Practical Value

The third purpose was to provide the greatest practical value of the power resource to SNR and to customers contracting with SNR. The 2004 EIS analysis found that Federal hydropower is a good value on the power market. However, the structure and cost of supplemental purchases can change the cost of the Federal resource and result in very small socioeconomic effects. The baseload alternative was considered and not selected because it represented the least-effective use of the CVP hydropower resource in the overall energy market. The preferred alternative was found to result in the lowest costs and most beneficial socioeconomic effects.

Protect the Human and Natural Environment

The fourth purpose was to protect the human and natural environment. The baseload alternative was considered but not selected because of the adverse environmental effects of constructing and operating necessary replacement capacity to maintain existing load-carrying capability in the northern and central California region. In addition, no significant positive benefits were identified to environmental resources that would offset the negative impacts of construction and operation of new generation capacity.

Although designated as environmentally preferred, the peaking alternative was not selected because it does not economically optimize integrated scheduling of Western's hydropower generation with the generation of its customers. The preferred alternative provides nearly identical environmental benefits as the peaking alternative, but provides greater economic benefits, and has no major negative environmental impacts.

The no-action alternative was not selected because it is not consistent with customers' needs in a restructured utility industry environment. Many of Western's customers have indicated they would like the hydropower priced separately from purchases, and would like to make their own purchases without incurring economic penalties. The no-action alternative includes substantial firming purchases with the purchased power cost melded with the hydropower cost, contrary to these customers' preference and to price optimization in a restructured utility environment.

The renewables alternative was not selected because it does not economically optimize the use of CVP power resources and because the

preferred alternative allows purchases of power generated from renewable resources. In the preferred alternative, Western can make power purchases on behalf of customers at the customers' request, and these purchases can be from renewable resource generation if costs are competitive or if the customer is willing to pay the added cost. The renewables alternative is based on costs of hydropower and purchases being melded, while the preferred alternative is based on the hydropower and purchased power costs being disaggregated, allowing more freedom of choice among customers whether to take delivery of purchased power. The latter approach is considered to be more compatible with the developing competitive marketplace resulting from electric industry restructuring.

Responsiveness

Regarding responsiveness to future changes in CVP, Washoe, and the utility industry, the preferred alternative provides the greatest flexibility to customers and keeps the Federal resources at their highest, practical economic value while having no measurable impact on the environment.

Mitigation Action Plan

No Mitigation Action Plan will be prepared, as the 2004 EIS did not identify any significant environmental effects associated with Western's selected alternative that warrant the adoption of a monitoring program or mitigation measures.

Documents Available

For a copy of this Record of Decision or a copy of the final 2004 EIS and supporting documents, write to the 2004 EIS Project Manager at the address listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT Section.

Dated: April 11, 1997.

J.M. Shafer,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–10859 Filed 4–25–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5818-2]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Performance Evaluation Studies on Water and Wastewater Laboratories

AGENCY: Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), this notice announces that EPA is planning to submit the following continuing Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB): Performance Evaluation Studies on Water and Wastewater Laboratories, EPA #234.06, OMB #2080-0021, current expiration date is 7/31/97. 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 June 27, 1997.

ADDRESSES: National Exposure Research Laboratory, 26 W. Martin L. King Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45268.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Britton, (513) 569–7216, FAX to (513) 569–7115 or Email to BRITTON.PAUL@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Entities potentially affected by this action are laboratories which produce official/required drinking water or wastewater analyses.

Title: Performance Evaluation Studies on Water and Wastewater Laboratories (OMB Control No. 2080–0021; EPA ICR No. 234.06) currently expiring 7/31/97. This is a request for extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: The U.S.EPA receives

analytical results on drinking waters and wastewaters from a variety of laboratories and must rely on these data as a primary basis for many of its regulatory decisions. As a consequence, it has become very important to have an objective demonstration that the contributing laboratories are capable of producing valid data. The Laboratory Performance Evaluation Studies are designed to fulfill this need to document and improve the quality of analytical data for certain critical analyses within drinking water, major point-source discharge and ambient water quality samples. Participation in Water Pollution (WP) studies that relate to wastewater analyses, and Water Supply (WS) studies that relate to drinking water analyses, is only mandated by the U.S.EPA for those laboratories that are receiving federal funds to do such analyses, however successful participation in these studies is often required by states that certify laboratories for water and wastewater analyses. Participation in the Discharge Monitoring Report—Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) studies is mandatory for those designated wastewater dischargers who are doing self-monitoring analyses

required under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

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 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/type of study	Studies/year	Resp./study	Ave. burden hours/resp.	Total annual respondent burden hours
Water Pollution Studies	2 1 1 2 2	3,262.5 6,112 300 2,202.5 300	6.10 4.37 66.2 7.87 5.34	39,802 26,710 19,860 34,667 3,204
Total				124,243

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: April 16, 1997.

T.A. Clark,

Acting Director, NERL, ORD.
[FR Doc. 97–10884 Filed 4–25–97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPPTS-42192; FRL-5714-6]

Endocrine Disruptors; Notice of Public Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: EPA is announcing the third meeting of the Endocrine Disruptors Screening and Testing Advisory Committee (EDSTAC), a committee

established under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) to advise EPA on a strategy for screening chemicals and pesticides for their potential to disrupt endocrine function in humans and wildlife.

DATES: The meeting will begin on April 29 at 9 a.m. and adjourn April 30 at 12:30 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Cross Keys Inn, 5100 Fall Road, Baltimore, MD. The telephone number at the hotel is 410–532–6900. The fax number is 410–532–2403.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical information, contact Dr. Anthony Maciorowski (telephone: 202–260–3048; e-mail:

maciorowski.tony@epamail.epa.gov) or Mr. Gary Timm (telephone 202–260– 1859; e-mail:

timm.gary@epamail.epa.gov) at EPA. To obtain additional information please contact the contractor assisting EPA with meeting facilitation and logistics: Ms. Tutti Otteson, The Keystone Center, P.O. Box 8606, Keystone, CO 80435; telephone: 970–468–5822; fax: 970–262–0152; e-mail:

totteson@keystone.org.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA's Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances is taking the lead for the Agency on endocrine disruption screening and testing required by recent legislation (i.e., reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act and passage of the Food Quality Protection Act) and has formed an advisory committee (EDSTAC) to provide advice and counsel to the Agency on a strategy to screen and test endocrine disrupting

chemicals and pesticides in humans, fish and wildlife. The first EDSTAC meeting was held on December 12–13, 1996 (61 FR 60280, November 27, 1996)(FRL–5575–7) and the second meeting was held on February 5–6, 1997 (62 FR 3894, January 27, 1997) (FR–5585–2).

It is proposed that the agenda for this meeting includes the following topics:

Tuesday, April 29

1. Overview of Activities Since the Houston Meeting—Principles Work Group Report, Screening and Testing Work Group Report, Communication and Outreach Work Group Report, and the Priority Setting Work Group Report.

2. Opening Comments Clarifying the Charge to the EDSTAC and Perspective on Progress to Date—Dr. Lynn Goldman.

3. Opportunity for Full Committee Dialogue and Questions and Answers on Dr. Goldman's Clarifications to the EDSTAC Charge.

4. Presentation of Revised Draft Conceptual Framework Developed by the Principles Work Group.

- 5. Discuss and Attempt to Come to Consensus on the Definition of "Endocrine Disruption" that will be used by the EDSTAC.
- 6. Public Comment—Members of the public will be given an opportunity to comment on any aspect of the convening of the EDSTAC. The precise amount of time that will be given to each individual will depend on the number of people wishing to provide comment during this time period.

Wednesday, April 30

1. Discuss Implications of the EDSTAC Conceptual Framework to the