ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5991–2]

Agency Announcement of Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Collection of 1997 Iron and Steel Industry Data (EPA ICR 1830.01)

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) is being forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval: ''Collection of 1997 Iron and Steel Industry Data'' (EPA ICR No. 1830.01). The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and the anticipated burden the data collection will create on recipient facilities, and the collection methodology EPA will use to distribute the data collection instruments. The ICR also includes representative copies of the specific data collection instruments that will be distributed to the public.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before May 4, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact Sandy Farmer at EPA by phone at (202) 260–2740, by email at farmer.sandy@epamail.epa.gov, or download off the Internet at http://www.epa.gov/ost/ironsteel.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Information Collection Request for the Collection of 1997 Iron and Steel Industry Data (EPA ICR No.1830.01). This is a new collection.

Abstract: The Collection of 1997 Iron and Steel Industry Data is intended to collect, from industry, the type of technical and economic information required by EPA to develop effluent limitations guidelines for Iron and Steel industry activities. The Iron and Steel industry activities include cokemaking, sintering, briquetting, ironmaking, steelmaking, ladle metallurgy, vacuum degassing, casting, hot forming, salt bath descaling, acid pickling, cold forming, alkaline cleaning, hot coating, electroplating, and utility operations.

EPA is promulgating effluent limitations guidelines and standards for the Iron and Steel industry in accordance with the consent decree entered in the case of *Natural Resources Defense Council, et al.* v. *Reilly, Civ. No. 89–2980* (D.C. Cir., as amended). EPA will issue this survey under authority of section 308 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1318, which authorizes EPA to require the owner or operator of a point source to submit certain information at EPA's request. The data collected will provide EPA with the technical and economic information required to effectively evaluate pollution control technologies and the economic achievability of the final rule. EPA will consider both technical performance and economic achievability (including cost effectiveness analyses of alternative pollution control technologies) when developing the final regulations. An Agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, an information collection 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** document announcing the impending submission of the ICR to OMB, as required under the Paperwork Reduction Act's regulations at 5 CFR 1320.8(d), was published on October 20, 1997. Six sets of comments from the public regarding the October 20, 1997 announcement (62 FR 54453) were received by the Agency. These comments, and EPA's responses, are presented in Attachment 5 of the ICR.

Burden Statement: The data collection consists of 5 elements: the Detailed Survey, the Short Survey, the Capital Cost Survey, the Production follow-up question, and the Analytical data follow-up question. The total nationwide public reporting and record keeping burden for this information collection is estimated to be 107,116 hours or $3,654,832. The nationwide burden will be distributed among the 901 industry sites. 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; to 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; to adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; to train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; to search data sources; to complete and review the collection of information; and to transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

EPA will send the Detailed Survey to the 244 sites which comprise the following types of mills: Integrated with cokemaking, Integrated without cokemaking, Non-integrated with finishing, Non-integrated without finishing, Stand-alone cokemaking, Stand-alone DRI or sintering, Stand-alone finishing, and Stand-alone hot forming. These 244 sites will have an average estimated burden of 258 hours or $8,703 per site. EPA will send the Short Survey to the 657 sites which comprise the following types of mills: Stand-alone pipe/tube, Stand-alone hot dip coating, Stand-alone cold forming, and Stand-alone wire. Each of these 657 sites will have an average estimated burden of 62 hours or $2,140 per site.

EPA will distribute the Cost Survey to no more than 100 iron and steel sites, to be chosen based on responses to the Detailed and Short Surveys. Each of these 100 sites will have an estimated burden of 12 hours or $513 per site. EPA will distribute the Production follow-up question to no more than 100 iron and steel sites, to be chosen based on responses to the Detailed and Short Surveys. Each of these 100 sites will have an estimated burden of 10 hours or $409 per site. EPA will distribute the Analytical data follow-up question to no more than 100 iron and steel sites, to be chosen based on responses to the Detailed and Short Surveys. Each of these 100 sites will have an estimated burden of 10 hours or $332 per site.

EPA made every effort possible to reduce the national reporting burden associated with this data collection. The following are examples of how EPA reduced the burden associated with the current data collection:

1. EPA reduced the number of questions in the Detailed Survey, based on comments from the public and an internal reevaluation of what information was considered to be essential to the guideline development.

2. EPA developed a Short Survey instrument to be sent to the majority of the sites. EPA anticipates that many of these sites will be small businesses, representing a relatively small portion of the industry wastewater flow rates and pollutant loadings.

3. EPA has conducted outreach with the following trade associations, which represent the vast majority of the facilities that will be affected by this guideline: American Iron and Steel Institute, Steel Manufacturers Association, Specialty Steel Industry of North America, the Cold Finished Steel Bar Institute, The Wire Association International, Incorporated, the Steel Tube Institute of North America, the American Galvanizers Association, Incorporated, and the American Coke and Coal Chemicals Association. Outreach has involved distributing advance copies of the survey and meeting with representatives of the

trade associations to discuss the guidelines development process and the survey. Many of the comments received during these meetings have been incorporated.

4. EPA plans to operate a telephone help-line and develop an internet address to answer questions regarding the survey.

5. EPA plans to conduct a series of survey workshops.

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. 1830.01 in any inquiry.

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 the EPA, 725 17th Street N.W., Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: March 30, 1998.

Richard T. Westlund,

Acting Director,

Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 98–8788 Filed 4–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5490–4]

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 March 23, 1998 Through March 27, 1998 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9

EIS No. 980098, Final EIS, FHW, NC, US 70 Goldsboro Bypass Construction, US 70 in the vicinity of NC–1237 to US 70 in the vicinity of NC–1731, Funding and COE Permits, Wayne County, NC, *Due:* May 4, 1998, *Contact:* Nicolas L. Graf (919) 856–4346.

EIS No. 980099, Final EIS, SFW, MN, IA, Northern Tallgrass Prairie Habitat Preservation Area (HPA), Implementation, To Preserve, Restore and Manage, several counties, MN and several counties, IA, *Due:* May 4, 1998, *Contact:* Jane West (612) 713–5314.

EIS No. 980100, Draft EIS, FHW, WV, New River Parkway Project, Design, Construction and Management, between I–64 Interchanges to Hinton, Raleigh and Summers Counties, WV, *Due:* May 28, 1998, *Contact:* David A. Leighow (304) 347–5268.

EIS No. 980101, Draft EIS, AFS, CO, North Fork Salvage Timber Analysis Area, Implementation, Medicine Bow-Routt National Forest, Routt County, CO, *Due:* May 18, 1998, *Contact:* Larry Lindner (970) 870–2220.

EIS No. 980102, Final EIS, NPS, HI, Ala Kahakai ''Trail By the Sea'' National Trail Study, Implementation, Hawaii Island, Hawaii County, HI, *Due:* May 4, 1998, *Contact:* Meredith Kaplan (415) 427–1438.

EIS No. 980103, Final EIS, AFS, CO, Routt National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, Implementation, Grand, Routt, Rio Blanco, Jackson, Moffat and Garfield Counties, CO, *Due:* May 4, 1998, *Contact:* Jerry E. Schmidt (307) 745–2300.

EIS No. 980104, Draft EIS, FTA, CA, Third Street Light Rail Project, Transportation Improvements, Funding, US Coast Guard Permit, and COE Section 404 Permit, San Francisco Municipal Railway, In the City and County of San Francisco, CA, *Due:* May 19, 1998, *Contact:* Bob Hom (415) 744–3133.

EIS No. 980105, Final EIS, USA, NY, Seneca Army Depot Activity Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Seneca County and the City of Geneva, Ontario County, NY, *Due:* May 4, 1998, *Contact:* Ltc. Rob Dow (703) 693–9217.

Dated: March 31, 1998.

Ken Mittleholtz,

Environmental Protection Specialist, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 98–8841 Filed 4–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5490–5]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared March 16, 1998 Through March 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, 1997 (62 FR 16154).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–G65067–LA Rating EC2, isatchie National Forest Revision Land and Resource Management Plan, Implementation, Claiborne, Grant, Natchitoches, Rapides, Vernon, Webster and Winn Parishes, LA.

Summary: EPA has requested additional information in the areas of Environmental Justice, ecosystem management, NEPA compliance assurances for future military use activities affecting national forest lands and cumulative impact assessment summaries for the alternatives considered.

ERP No. D–AFS–L65299–AK Rating EO2, Cascade Point Access Road, Construction, Maintenance and Operation, Road Easement within National Forest System land in the vicinity of Echo Cove, EPA Permit, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Juneau, AK.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections based on a Purpose and Need statement that restricted the range of alternatives, and an inadequate analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts to Berners Bay. EPA recommends that more information including an assessment of impacts about reasonably foreseeable development at Cascade Point be included.

ERP No. D–COE–E32077–GA Rating EC2, Brunswick Harbor Deepening Federal Navigation Project, Improvements, Brunswick, Glynn County, GA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns over the potential for unacceptable water quality impacts resulting from the extensive navigation deepening as well as how the necessary mitigation for project impacts will be designed and implemented.

ERP No. D–DOE–J22005–CO Rating EC2, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Srub Alloy Stored, Golden, CO.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the alternatives analysis and recommends developing an on-site storage alternative in addition to the WIPP alternative.

ERP No. D–USN–K11087–CA Rating EC2, Long Beach Complex Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, NPDES