

## EXHIBIT 11.—ESTIMATED ANNUAL BURDEN HOURS AND COSTS—ALL EXISTING FACILITIES

Type of facility	Annual burden hours			Total burden hours	Annual cost
	Managerial	Technical	Clerical		
Storage:					
Small .....	75,157	758,404	17,644	1,013,485	\$27,581,027
Medium .....	10,200	200,909	29,054	240,163	6,607,489
Large .....	1,581	60,654	4,504	66,739	1,862,563
Production:					
Small .....	47,940	676,968	113,312	838,220	23,088,383
Medium .....	16,728	270,183	47,650	334,561	9,158,414
Large .....	0	0	0	0	0
Total .....	151,606	1,967,118	212,164	2,493,168	68,297,876

## EXHIBIT 12.—ESTIMATED ANNUAL BURDEN HOURS AND COSTS—ALL NEW FACILITIES

Type of facility	Annual burden hours			Total burden hours	Annual cost
	Managerial	Technical	Clerical		
Storage:					
Small .....	13,662	62,504	10,474	86,640	\$2,486,233
Medium .....	1,854	15,126	2,039	19,019	536,768
Large .....	288	4,126	413	4,827	135,181
Production:					
Small .....	8,718	45,697	6,684	61,099	1,750,741
Medium .....	3,042	25,071	3,346	31,459	887,491
Large .....	0	0	0	0	0
Total .....	27,564	152,524	22,956	203,044	5,796,414

No person is 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 displayed at 40 CFR Part 9.

Send comments regarding these matters, or any other aspects of the information collection, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to the address listed above under **ADDRESSES** near the top of this Notice.

Dated: April 1, 1996.  
 Elaine F. Davies,  
*Acting Director, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response.*  
 [FR Doc. 96-8481 Filed 4-4-96; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**[ER-FRL-5415-3]****Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments**

Availability of EPA comments prepared March 18, 1996 Through March 22, 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.

## Summary of Rating Definitions

*Environmental Impact of the Action*

## LO—Lack of Objections

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the

proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

## EC—Environmental Concerns

EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

## EO—Environmental Objections

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

## EU—Environmentally Unsatisfactory

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

*Adequacy of the Impact Statement*

## Category 1—Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

## Category 2—Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably

available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

#### Category 3—Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

#### Draft EISs

ERP No. D-NOA-E64016-FL Rating LO, Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary Comprehensive Management Plan, Implementation and Special-Use-Permit, Monroe County, FL.

*Summary: EPA had no objections to the proposed project. Furthermore, EPA believed that the Florida Keys Management Plan/EIS is a well-conceived comprehensive blueprint for saving the fragile coral reef ecosystem that is threatened by unsustainable human activities.*

ERP No. D-SFW-K99028-CA Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan, Implementation and Associated Incidental Take Permit Issuance, Central and Coastal Subregion, Orange County, CA.

*Summary: EPA had environmental concerns with the scarce information provided in the joint programmatic EIS on the role of this NCCP/HCP in the overall NCCP effort and regional species population viability; potential effects on water quality, aquatic resources and air quality; adequate and sound science; subsequent environmental reviews; funding and administration of the proposed plan and environmental justice issues. EPA commended the US Fish and Wildlife Service and project proponents for the multi-species/multi-*

*habitat approach, incorporation of proactive measures to minimize adverse impacts on habitat approved for conversions, the commitment to adaptive management and emphasis on incorporating nearly all major stakeholders in protecting the diverse ecosystems present in the plan area.*

ERP No. D-USN-11021-PA Rating EC2, Philadelphia Naval Base, Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Philadelphia, PA.

*Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding potential wetland impacts, site contamination and remedial action. EPA requested that these issues be discussed in more detail in the final EIS.*

ERP No. DS-NOA-E91007-00 Rating LO, South Atlantic Region Shrimp Fishery Management Plan, Implementation, Additional Information, Amendment 2 (Bycatch Reduction), Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), NC, SC, FL and GA.

*Summary: EPA had no objections to the proposed actions, but stressed the need to research Bycatch Reduction Devices that will increase the catch-per-unit effort for shrimp and achieve bycatch reductions.*

#### Final EISs

ERP No. F-BLM-K08018-CA, Alturas 345 Kilovolt (KV) Electric Power Transmission Line Project, Construction, Operation and Maintenance, Right-of-Way Grant Approval, Special-Use-Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, Susanville District, Modoc, Lassen and Sierra Counties, CA and Washoe County, NV.

*Summary: EPA continued to express environmental concerns about increased voltages in existing power lines near residential areas and EPA suggested that information to address this should be included in the Record of Decision.*

ERP No. F-DOE-A00168-00, Nuclear Weapons Nonproliferation Policy Concerning Foreign Research Reactor Spent Nuclear Fuel, Implementation, United States and Abroad.

*Summary: EPA had no objections to the proposed project.*

ERP No. F-FHW-L40191-AK, Whittier Access Project, Construction between Port of Whittier and Seward Highway, Funding, Right-of-Way Agreement and COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Chugauch National Forest, Municipality of Anchorage, City of Whittier, AK.

*Summary: EPA provided no formal written comments to the preparing agency. EPA had no objection to the preferred alternative as described in the final EIS.*

Dated: April 2, 1996.

B. Katherine Biggs,

*Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.*

[FR Doc. 96-8484 Filed 4-4-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

#### [ER-FRL-5415-2]

#### 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 25, 1996 Through March 29, 1996 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 960137, Draft EIS, AFS, MT, Sheep Range and China Basin Salvage Project, Implementation, Kootenai National Forest, Libby Ranger District, Lincoln County, MT, Due: May 20, 1996, Contact: Leanne Martin (406) 293-6211.

EIS No. 960138, Draft EIS, FAA, HI, Kahului Airport Master Plan Improvements, Implementation, Funding and Approval of Permits, Kahului, Maui County, HI, Due: May 23, 1996, Contact: David J. Welhouse (808) 541-1243.

EIS No. 960139, Final EIS, FHW, WI, US 151/Fond du Lac Bypass Construction, US 151 and CTH "D" to US 151 and WI-149, Funding, Fond du Lac County, WI, Due: May 06, 1996, Contact: Richard C. Madrzak (608) 829-7510.

EIS No. 960140, Final EIS, BLM, MT, Zortman and Landusky Mines Reclamation Plan Modifications and Mine Life Extensions, Approval of Mine Operation, Mine Reclamation and COE Section 404 Permits, Little Rocky Mountains, Phillip County, MT, Due: May 06, 1996, Contact: Scott Haight (406) 538-7461.

EIS No. 960141, Final EIS, AFS, CO, UT, Steamboat Ski Area Expansion, Implementation, Medicine Bow-Routt National Forest, Mt. Weiner, Special-Use-Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, Routt County, CO, Due: May 06, 1996, Contact: Wendy Schmitzer (970) 879-1870.

EIS No. 960142, Draft EIS, NPS, NB, Niobrara National Scenic River, General Management Plan, Niobrara/Missouri National Scenic Riverways, Implementation, Brown, Cherry, Keya Paha and Rock Counties, NB, Due: May 20, 1996, Contact: Warren Hill (402) 336-3970.

EIS No. 960143, Draft EIS, FHW, TN, Shelby Avenue/Demonbreum Street Corridor, from I-65 North to I-40