ground-water sampling of all on-Site monitoring wells to establish baseline VOC, PAH, and metals concentrations. In addition, UPRR conducted a soil treatability study to test tap water and commercially available surfactants as potential soil flushing solutions for use in the in situ soil flushing system.

Based on the results of the pre-RD activities, EPA determined that an amendment to the ROD was necessary. The Amended ROD, signed on September 29, 1994, set forth the final remedial performance standards and cleanup levels for contaminants at the Site. The Amended ROD also modified the original remedy by eliminating the requirements to install an in situ soil flushing system, the DAF treatment component of the ground-water pretreatment system, and the permanent Site fence.

Based on the treatability study test results and the tests performed on the contaminated soil beneath the sludge pit, EPA concluded that in situ soil flushing would not achieve the goal of improving or providing appreciable protection of the ground water. The tests also showed that the DAF unit was not needed since contaminant concentrations in leachate and the upper aquifer were significantly below the required discharge limits mandated by the POTW. The DAF unit was not suitable for removal of the free oil whereas the oil/water separator, which remained a part of the pretreatment system, was designed for that purpose. UPRR installed a temporary fence during remedial action for Site security and to protect the public from physical contact with contaminated material during construction. Since contaminated material in the sludge pit was excavated and filled with clean material, future exposure to contaminated soil was eliminated once construction activities were completed, thereby eliminating the need for a permanent fence.

C. Characterization of Risk

Prior to cleanup, the preliminary environmental pathways of concern were potential direct contact with sludge in the pit and potential ingestion of contaminated ground water. The estimated pre-remediation site-specific cancer risk for ground water was 1 x 10^{-3}.

Remedial action began in 1994 and included excavation of the sludge pit, filling the pit with clean material, installation of a geomembrane cover, no-dig barrier and final grading. All contract work was completed by the end of November 1994.

UPRR began ground-water monitoring in July 1994 and ground-water extraction/treatment in late November 1994. In July 1995, UPRR submitted documentation that performance monitoring results indicated achievement of the ground-water performance standards. UPRR conducted its first round of long-term ground-water compliance monitoring on July 21, 1995. On August 8, 1995, EPA approved shut down of the ground-water extraction/treatment system. UPRR has conducted four rounds of long-term compliance monitoring since July 1995.

Removal of contaminated sludge and installation of a cover over the former sludge pit has eliminated direct contact as a potential route of exposure and removed the source of ground-water contamination. Analytical data from four rounds of ground-water compliance monitoring indicate that concentrations of contaminants of concern are below ROD cleanup levels. Current Site risk from chemicals of concern is 7×10^{-5}, which is less than the ROD cleanup level of 1×10^{-4} cumulative cancer risk for combined residential/industrial land use.

With the implementation and completion of all remedial activities, the Site no longer poses any threat to human health or the environment, insuring that no further action is required. With the exception of decommissioning of the extraction/treatment system and abandoning of monitoring wells, there are no other operation and maintenance activities to be performed at the Site. No hazardous substances were left on-Site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure; therefore, the five year review requirement of Section 121 (c) of SARA is not applicable.

D. Public Participation

Community input has been sought by EPA Region 10 throughout the cleanup process at the Site. Information repositories were established at the Southeastern Idaho Health District Office and at the Pocatello Public Library. Fact sheets were distributed in 1988, 1989, and 1990, and the proposed plan for cleanup was issued in 1991. Additional fact sheets were distributed in September 1992 and July 1994.

A copy of the Deletion Docket can be reviewed by the public at the Pocatello Public Library, or the EPA Region 10 Superfund Records Center. The Deletion Docket includes this document, the ROD, Amended ROD, Remedial Action Construction Report, and Final Site Close-Out Report. EPA Region 10 will also announce the availability of the Deletion Docket for public review in a local newspaper and informational fact sheet.

One of the three criteria for deletion specifies that EPA may delete a site from the NPL if ''responsible parties or other persons have implemented all appropriate response actions required.'' EPA, with the concurrence of IDEQ, believes that this criterion for deletion has been met. Ground-water and soil data from the Site confirm that the ROD cleanup goals have been achieved. There is no significant threat to human health or the environment and, therefore, no further remedial action is necessary. Consequently, EPA is proposing deletion of this Site from the NPL. Documents supporting this action are available in the docket at the information repositories.

Dated: July 10, 1997.

Chuck Clarke,

Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 97–19545 Filed 7–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

46 CFR Parts 90, 98, 125–136, 170, 174, and 175

[CGD 97–042]

Offshore Supply Vessels

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is considering developing additional regulations to address offshore supply vessels (OSV's). First, it needs to determine a tonnage breakpoint and appropriate standards for larger OSV's because of concerns on the adequacy of the existing regulations, especially for vessels competing in the international market. Second, because of industry commitments to a previous rulemaking, it needs to bring crew boats under regulations for OSV's.

DATES: Comments must reach the Coast Guard on or before September 23, 1997.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments to Executive Secretary, Marine Safety Council (G–LRA), Room 3406, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street, SW., Washington, DC 20593–0001, or deliver them to the same address between 9:30 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays The telephone number is (202) 267–1477.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James M. Magill, Office of Operating

and Environmental Standards (G–MSO–2), Room 1210, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street, SW., Washington, DC 20593, telephone (202) 267–1181.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Information

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this request by submitting written data, views, or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this notice, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit two copies of all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. Persons wanting acknowledgment of receipt of comments should enclose stamped, self-addressed postcards or envelopes. The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period.

The Coast Guard plans no public meeting. Persons may request a public meeting by writing to the address under **ADDRESSES**. The request should include the reasons why a meeting would be beneficial. If the Coast Guard determines that the opportunity for oral presentations is appropriate, it will hold a public meeting at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

On December 18, 1996, the Coast Guard published in the **Federal Register** a final rule (61 FR 66613) interpreting the alternative tonnage for OSVs and establishing a limit of 6,000 gross tons, as measured under the International Convention on Tonnage Measurement of Ships (ITC), for OSVs regulated under 46 CFR subchapter L. This tonnage corresponds to the maximum length of 100 meters for OSVs constructed to the latest international standards, and enables the domestic OSV industry to be more competitive in the international market. That final rule resulted from amended section 709(3) of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–324; 110 Stat. 3901) and resides in 46 CFR 125.160.

With the promulgation of the new definition of OSVs and the need for the fleet of OSVs to serve drilling and production units in deeper waters, the Coast Guard is closely monitoring all aspects of the design, construction, and operation of OSVs built since the effective date of that final rule. With the increase in gross tonnage and length of OSVs, it is obvious that larger OSVs need standards beyond those of 46 CFR subchapter L to address the safety concerns inherent within large size and deepwater operations. The National Offshore Safety Advisory Committee (NOSAC) recommended that the Coast Guard promulgate supplementary regulations to deal with the new issues peculiar to larger OSVs.

Comments received after the publishing of the interim rule on 46 CFR subchapter L in November 1995 also indicated a desire that the Coast Guard regulate crew boats under subchapter L. NOSAC recommended the same.

The final rule for 46 CFR subchapter L is currently in final clearance and should be published during July 1997. Although the Coast Guard cannot promulgate new rules until that rule is published, it can begin to develop them; hence this notice.

Discussion of Prospective Rules

The Coast Guard is publishing this notice to indicate its consideration of additional issues relating to OSVs. There are two main ones.

First, the Coast Guard is considering establishing a breakpoint in convention gross tonnage (between 2,000 ITC gross tons and 6,000 ITC gross tons) so as to develop two categories of OSVs, large and small. It also is considering developing appropriate standards for the larger OSVs beyond those now in subchapter L to enable the vessels to engage in fair competition in international markets while ensuring their safety.

Second, the Coast Guard is considering regulating crew boats under 46 CFR subchapter L. These boats would have been proper subjects of the rule about to become final, but the issue of how to treat them arose too late.

Questions

To adequately address the issues raised by this notice, the Coast Guard needs more information. Public response to the questions contained in this notice will help the Coast Guard to more completely and carefully consider these issues. The questions are not all-inclusive, and any supplemental, germane information is welcome. Responses to the following questions would be particularly useful:

1. Where (between 2,000 ITC gross tons and 6,000 ITC gross tons) should the breakpoint between large and small OSVs fall, and for what reasons? For example, given the provisions of the 1978 International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW), does a breakpoint of 3,000 gross tons make sense?

2. What standards (whether domestic, international, or both) beyond those already in subchapter L should the larger OSVs meet?

3. Should crew boats be regulated under 46 CFR subchapter L? Why or why not?

4. What should be the appropriate manning levels of larger OSVs? Of crew boats? Of both?

5. What should be the appropriate license requirements of larger OSVs (as provided for by STCW)? Of crew boats? Of both?

Dated: July 15, 1997.

R.C. North,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Assistant Commandant for Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 97–19449 Filed 7–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 1

[MD Docket No. 96–186; FCC 97–254]

Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 1997

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Further notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: On June 26, 1997, the Commission released a Report and Order that revised its Schedule of Regulatory Fees in order to recover the amount of regulatory fees that Congress, pursuant to Section 9(a) of the Communications Act, as amended, has required it to collect for Fiscal Year (FY) 1997. See 47 U.S.C. 159 (a). The intended effect of this action is to seek further comments concerning our proposals to require Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) licensees to maintain and make available to the Commission within 30 days, upon request by the Managing Director, pursuant to delegated authority, documentation concerning the basis for their fee payment; require that non-profit entities exempt from the regulatory fee requirement because of possessing either non-profit status under § 501 of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. 501, or certification as a non-profit corporation or other non-profit entity by state or other governmental authority submit documentation of their non-profit status; and publish annually in the **Federal Register** lists of those commercial communications firms and